UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01457930 4

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/vindiciaehiberni00careuoft

# VINDICIÆ HIBERNICÆ:

OR,

# IRELAND VINDICATED:

AN ATTEMPT TO DEVELOP AND EXPOSE A FEW OF

THE MULTIFARIOUS ERRORS AND FALSEHOODS

RESPECTING IRELAND,

IN THE HISTORIES OF

MAY, TEMPLE, WHITELOCK, BORLASE, RUSHWORTH, CLARENDON, COX, CARTE, LELAND, WARNER, MACAULEY, HUME, AND OTHERS:

PARTICULARLY IN THE LEGENDARY TALES OF

THE CONSPIRACY AND PRETENDED MASSACRE

OF 1641.

---


BY M. CAREY,

AUTHOR OF ESSAYS ON BANKING, POLITICAL OLIVE BRANCH, &c.


---

"The history of Ireland's unhappy connexion with England, exhibits, from first to last, a detail of the most persevering, galling, grinding, insulting, and systematic oppression, to be found any where, *except among the Helots of Sparta.* There is not a national feeling that has not been insulted and trodden under foot; a national right that has not been withheld, until fear forced it from the grasp of England; or a dear or ancient prejudice that has not been violated, in that abused country. As Christians, the people of Ireland have been denied, under penalties and disqualifications, the exercise of the rites of the Catholic religion, *venerable for its antiquity; admirable for its unity; and consecrated by the belief of some of the best men that ever breathed.* As men, they have been deprived of the common rights of British subjects, under the pretext that they were incapable of enjoying them: which pretext had no other foundation than their resistance of oppression, only the more severe by being sanctioned by the laws. *England first denied them the means of improvement; and then insulted them with the imputation of barbarism.*" PAULDING.

"There is but little respite from exasperating oppression and unmerited cruelty. The eye wanders over a dreary scene of desolation, without a single point on which it can rest. The heart of the Philanthropist sinks under a hopeless despondency; and passively yields to the unchristian and impious reflection, that the poor people of Ireland are a devoted race, whom Providence has abandoned to the malignant ingenuity of an insatiable enemy."

LAWLESS.

"*There is no instance, even in the ten persecutions, of such severity as that which has been exercised over the Catholics of Ireland.*" S. JOHNSON.

---


PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY M. CAREY AND SON.

1819.

DA
940
C32

LIBRARY
APR 5 1972
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

*EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA*, TO WIT:

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the sixth day of March, in the (L. S.) forty-third year of the Independence of the United States of America, A. D. 1819, Mathew Carey, of the said District, hath deposited in this office the Title of a Book, the right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, *to wit:*

"Vindiciæ Hibernicæ: or, Ireland Vindicated: an Attempt to develop and expose a few of the multifarious Errors and Falsehoods respecting Ireland, in the Histories of May, Temple, Whitelock, Borlase, Rushworth, Clarendon, Cox, Carte, Leland, Warner, Macauley, Hume, and others: particularly in the Legendary Tales of the Conspiracy and Pretended Massacre of 1641. By M. Carey, Author of Essays on Banking, Political Olive Branch, &c.

'The history of Ireland's unhappy connexion with England, exhibits, from first to last, a detail of the most persevering, galling, grinding, insulting, and systematic oppression, to be found any where, *except among the Helots of Sparta.* There is not a national feeling that has not been insulted and trodden under foot; a national right that has not been withheld, until fear forced it from the grasp of England; or a dear or ancient prejudice that has not been violated, in that abused country. As Christians, the people of Ireland have been denied, under penalties and disqualifications, the exercise of the rites of the Catholic religion, *venerable for its antiquity; admirable for its unity; and consecrated by the belief of some of the best men that ever breathed.* As men, they have been deprived of the common rights of British subjects, under the pretext that they were incapable of enjoying them: which pretext had no other foundation than their resistance of oppression, only the more severe by being sanctioned by the laws. *England first denied them the means of improvement; and then insulted them with the imputation of barbarism.*' PAULDING.

'There is but little respite from exasperating oppression and unmerited cruelty. The eye wanders over a dreary scene of desolation, without a single point on which it can rest. The heart of the Philanthropist sinks under a hopeless despondency; and passively yields to the unchristian and impious reflection, that the poor people of Ireland are a devoted race, whom Providence has abandoned to the malignant ingenuity of an insatiable enemy.' LAWLESS.

'*There is no instance, even in the ten persecutions, of such severity as that which has been exercised over the Catholics of Ireland.*' S. JOHNSON."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, intituled, "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned." And also to the Act, entitled, "An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled, 'An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned,' and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

D. CALDWELL, *Clerk of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.*

LYDIA R. BAILEY, PRINTER.

TO

THOSE SUPERIOR SPIRITS,

WHO SCORN THE YOKE OF

FRAUD, IMPOSTURE, BIGOTRY, AND DELUSION;

WHO,

AT THE SACRED SHRINE OF TRUTH,

WILL OFFER UP THEIR PREJUDICES,

HOW INVETERATE SOEVER,

WHEN HER BRIGHT TORCH ILLUMINATES THEIR MINDS;

WHO,

POSSESSING THE INESTIMABLE BLESSINGS

OF

THRICE-HOLY AND REVERED LIBERTY,

ACQUIRED BY AN ARDUOUS STRUGGLE AGAINST

A MERE INCIPIENT DESPOTISM,

WILL SYMPATHIZE WITH THOSE

WHO CONTENDED ARDENTLY, ALTHOUGH UNSUCCESSFULLY,

AGAINST AS GRIEVOUS AN OPPRESSION

AS EVER PRESSED TO THE EARTH

A NOBLE AND GENEROUS NATION,

WHICH EMBARKED IN THE SAME GLORIOUS CAUSE

AS LEONIDAS, EPAMINONDAS, BRUTUS, THE PRINCE OF ORANGE, WILLIAM TELL, FAYETTE, HANCOCK, ADAMS, FRANKLIN, AND WASHINGTON,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED.

IT IS LIKEWISE DEDICATED TO

THE IMMORTAL MEMORY OF

THE DESMONDS, THE O'NIALS, THE O'DONNELS, THE O'MOORES, THE PRESTONS, THE MOUNTGARRETS, THE CASTLEHAVENS, THE FITZGERALDS, THE SHEARESES, THE TONES, THE EMMETTS,

AND

THE MYRIADS OF ILLUSTRIOUS IRISHMEN,

WHO SACRIFICED LIFE OR FORTUNE,

IN THE UNSUCCESSFUL EFFORT TO EMANCIPATE A COUNTRY

ENDOWED BY HEAVEN

WITH AS MANY AND AS CHOICE BLESSINGS

AS ANY PART OF THE TERRAQUEOUS GLOBE,

BUT, FOR AGES, A HOPELESS AND HELPLESS VICTIM

TO A FORM OF GOVERNMENT

TRANSCENDENTLY PERNICIOUS.

*Philadelphia, March* 6, 1819.

# KEY TO THE REFERENCES.

*To enable any reader, who may feel so disposed, to verify the facts and quotations in this work, I annex a List of the Authors, with the dates of the several editions. Having, to avoid encumbering the bottoms of the pages with tedious repetitions of the titles of works, generally referred to the author's names, this list furnishes a key to the references.*


*Burke.* Works of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke. 6 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1807.
*Borlase.* History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion. Folio. London, 1680.
*Burnet.* Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Times. 2 vols. folio London, 1724.
*Burton.* History of the Kingdom of Ireland. By R. Burton. Westminster, 1811.
*Baker.* Chronicles of the Kings of England. Folio. London, 1670.
*Carleton.* A Thankful Remembrance of God's Mercy. By George, Bishop of Chichester. 8vo. London, 1630.
*Cabala.* Cabala: Sive Scrinia Sacra, Mysteries of State and Government. Folio. London, 1683.
*Curry.* An Historical and Critical Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland. By John Curry, M. D. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1786.
*Clarendon.* History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. By the Earl of Clarendon. 6 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1707.
*Clarendon's I.* History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of Ireland. By the Earl of Clarendon. 8vo. London, 1720.
*Clarendon's S. P.* State Papers. By the Earl of Clarendon. 2 vols. folio. Oxford, 1773.
*Crawford.* History of Ireland, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. By William Crawford. 2 vols. 8vo. Strabane, 1783.
*Carte.* History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormond. 3 vols. folio. London, 1736.
*Cox.* Hibernia Anglicana: or the History of Ireland. By Richard Cox, Esqr. London, 1689.
*Davies.* Historical Tracts. By Sir John Davies, Attorney-General in Ireland. 8vo. Dublin, 1787.
*Daniel.* The Collection of the History of England. By Samuel Daniel. Folio. London, 1650.
*Derry.* Irish Historical Library. By William, Lord Bishop of Derry. 8vo. Dublin, 1724.
*Essex.* Letters written by His Excellency Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. 4to. London, 1770.
*Frankland.* Annals of King James and Charles I. Folio. London, 1681.
*Gordon.* History of Ireland, from the earliest Accounts to the Union. By the Rev. James Gordon. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1806.
*Hibernica.* Harris's Hibernica: or, Some Ancient Pieces respecting Ireland. 8vo. Dublin, 1770.
*Harris.* History and Antiquities of the City of Dublin. By William Harris. 8vo. London, 1776.
*Hollinshed.* Chronicles of England, Ireland, and Scotland. 6 vols. 4to. London, 1807.
*Hume.* History of England. By David Hume. 6 vols. 8vo. Albany, 1816.
*Hume's E.* Hume's Essays. 2 vols. 8vo. Philadelphia, 1817.
*Journals.** Journals of the House of Commons of England. Folio.


* The Irish Journals are referred to in page 159.

*King*. State of the Protestants in Ireland, under the late King James's Government. By Archbishop King. 8vo. London, 1692.
*Leland*. History of Ireland, from the Invasion to the Present Time. By T. Leland. 4 vols. 8vo. Philadelphia, 1774.
*Ludlow*. Memoirs of Edward Ludlow, Esqr. 3 vols. 8vo. Vevay, 1698.
*May*. History of the Parliament of England, which began November 3, 1640. By Thomas May. 4to. London, 1812.
*Memoirs*. Memoirs of the History of Ireland, from the Restoration. 8vo. London, 1774.
*Mountmorres*. History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament. By Lord Mountmorres. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1792.
*Macauley*. History of England. By Catharine Macauley. 9 vols. 4to. London, 1766.
*Nalson*. Collection of the Affairs of State. 2 vols. folio. London, 1682.
*Ormond*. Collection of Original Papers and Letters belonging to the Ormond Family. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1737.
*Orrery*. Collection of the State Letters of the first Earl of Orrery. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1743.
*Paulding*. United States and England. Philadelphia, 1816.
*Pacata Hibernia*. History of the War in Ireland. By Sir George Carew. 3 vols. 4to. Dublin, 1810.
*Plowden*. Historical View of the State of Ireland, from the Invasion to the Union. 6 vols. 8vo. Philadelphia, 1805.
*Petty*. Political Anatomy of Ireland. By William Petty. 12mo. Lond. 1691.
*Parliamentary History*. Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England. 24 vols. 8vo. London, 1762.
*Pickering*. Statutes at Large, from Magna Charta to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain. By Darby Pickering. London, 1762.
*Perrot*. Government of Ireland under Sir John Perrot. 12mo. London, 1626.
*Robbins*. An Exact Abridgment of all the Irish Statutes. 4to. Dublin, 1736.
*Rushworth*. Historical Collection of Private Passages of State. 8 vols. folio. London.
*Rapin*. History of England. By Mr. Rapin. 21 vols. 8vo. London, 1760.
*Statutes*. Collection of all the Statutes now in Use. Folio. Dublin, 1678.
*Spencer*. View of the State of Ireland. By Edmund Spencer. Dublin, 1809.
*Strafford*.* State Letters of the Earl of Strafford.
*Speed*. History of Great Britain. London, 1611.
*State Trials*. Cobbet's Complete Collection of State Trials, 1809.
*Smith*. Ancient and present State of the City and County of Cork. By Charles Smith. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin, 1774.
*Sydney Papers*. Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, &c. commonly called Sydney Papers. 2 vols. folio. London, 1746.
*Temple*. The Irish Rebellion. By Sir John Temple. Dublin, 1724.
*Thurloe*. Collection of State Papers, from 1638 to the Restoration. 7 vols. folio. London, 1742.
*Tichbourne*. Letter of Sir Henry Tichbourne to his Lady, of the Siege of Tredagh. Appended to Temple's History. Dublin, 1724.
*Warner*. History of the Rebellion and Civil War of Ireland. By Ferdinando Warner. 4to. London, 1768.
*Whitelock*. Memorials of English Affairs. Folio. London, 1682.
*Warwick*. Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles I. By Sir Philip Warwick. 8vo. London, 1703.
*Ware*. Antiquities and History of Ireland. By Sir James Ware. Folio. London, 1705.

* This work I could not procure, and have quoted it at second-hand from Dr. Curry.

*Having two vacant pages here, I have judged it would be acceptable to the reader to present him with some bold views of the subject embraced in the last chapter of this vindication, taken from high authority: I mean the conduct of the Protestant ascendency, and the character and tendency of the execrable code "to prevent the growth of Popery."*

"*I think I can hardly overrate the malignity of the principles of the Protestant ascendency, as they affect Ireland.*"*

"*No country, I believe, since the world began, suffered so much on account of religion.*"†

"We found the people heretics and idolaters; we have, by way of improving their condition, *rendered them slaves and beggars*. They remain in all the misfortune of their old errors, and *all the superadded misery of their recent punishment.*"‡

"They divided the nation into two distinct parties, without common interest, sympathy, or connexion. *One of these bodies was to possess all the franchises, all the property, all the education. The other was to be composed of drawers of water and cutters of turf for them.*"§

"Every measure was pleasing and popular, just in proportion as it tended to harass and ruin a set of people *who were looked upon as enemies to God and man; and indeed as a race of bigoted savages, who were a disgrace to human nature itself.*"‖

The code against the Roman Catholics "was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance; and *as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself*, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."¶

"To render men patient under a deprivation of all the rights of human nature, every thing which could give them a knowledge or feeling of those rights was rationally forbidden. To render humanity fit to be insulted, *it was fit that it should be degraded.*"**

* Burke, V. 232. † Idem, 213. ‡ Idem, 211.
§ Idem, III. 452. ‖ Idem, 473. ¶ Idem, 495.
** Idem, 438.

"*These rebellions were not produced by toleration, but by persecution; they arose not from just and mild government, but from the most unparalleled oppression.*"*

"Let three millions of people but abandon all that they and their ancestors have been taught to believe sacred, and *forswear it publicly, in terms the most degrading, scurrilous, and indecent, for men of integrity and virtue, and to abuse the whole of their former lives*, and to slander the education they have received, and nothing more is required of them. *There is no system of folly, or impiety, or blasphemy, or atheism, into which they may not throw themselves, and which they may not profess openly and as a system*, consistently with the enjoyment of all the privileges of a free citizen in the happiest constitution in the world."†

"No condescension was excessive *which could purchase for the Protestants of Ireland the uncontrolled indulgence of their hatred. They did not hesitate to fall, like Sampson, beneath the temple, provided the same ruin might become fatal to their adversaries:* nor, in the warmth of zeal against Popery, did they recollect that the freedom and commerce, which, with so much solicitude, they rejected, might not perhaps appear equally unacceptable to their children. After having hazarded the possession of every object that can make life precious, to avoid the probability of slavery, *they shaped for themselves a bondage which the most hardy tyrant could scarcely venture to propose;* and resigned, by an "awful interdict," every intercourse with the rest of mankind, whilst, in the narrow compass which remained, *they might wanton in the unconstrained enjoyment of revenge. Content to convert their country into one vast prison, if they could find within its bosom a dungeon still more hideous for their unhappy captives.*"‡

* Burke, V. 220. † Idem, 242.

‡ Review of some Interesting Periods of Irish History, 36.

# PREFACE.

TO most readers it will probably appear extraordinary, and a work of supererogation, that, in a country and an age so remote from the scene and the era of the events which are discussed in this vindication, it should be deemed either proper or necessary to investigate the subjects it embraces. The reasons are powerful, and fully justify the undertaking.

The history of Ireland, as stated and proved in the body of this work, is almost one solid mass of falsehood and imposture, erected, particularly during the seventeenth century, on the basis of fraud and perjury;—fraud and perjury so obvious, so stupid, and so flagitious, that, to the most superficial observer, it must be a subject of inexpressible astonishment how it ever gained currency.

Nevertheless, from such foul and polluted sources alone, the knowledge of Irish history is derived by nine-tenths of those who have condescended to study it: and, though it may appear extravagant, it is nevertheless a serious truth, that

a large portion even of those who pride themselves on their literary acquirements, are almost as ignorant of the affairs of Ireland, from the twelfth to the eighteenth century, as they are of those of the Arabians or Japanese. They are, in fact, in a worse state. With respect to the history of the Arabians and Japanese, they are barely ignorant: but, with respect to Ireland, almost all they know is wholly untrue. They give full faith and confidence to some of the most extravagant and romantic stories that ever were ushered on the world, to delude and deceive mankind, under the prostituted name of histories.

The terrific tales that are recorded of the events of the civil war of 1641, have sowed, and still continue to sow, a copious seed of the most vulgar and rancorous prejudices in the mind of man against his fellow man, which have sprouted forth with most pernicious luxuriance, and soured in his breast the sweet milk of human kindness towards those with whom he is in daily habits of association. These prejudices are too generally prevalent in the British dominions.

In Ireland, they have produced the most baleful consequences, and still afford some sort of countenance to the continuance of the remnant of an odious code of laws, by which, as appears in Chapter XXI. of this work,* rapine, cruelty, and demoralization have been legally systematized,

* Page 473.

and every principle of honour, honesty, good faith, justice, and sound policy, violated.

Many of these prejudices have been transplanted from their native soil by emigrants, and have taken root in this country, notwithstanding the general liberality of the age. It is true, however, that their range is confined, and their influence inconsiderable. Nevertheless, the erroneous impressions respecting Irish affairs, are, we repeat, universal here, from the corrupt sources whence her heart-rending story is derived.

Should it, therefore, be asked, why I have taken the trouble to explore the musty volumes whence I have drawn the materials for this work? I reply, I have had three motives: the pleasure of detecting and exposing fraud and imposture; the vindication of my native country; and the fond hope, that there are in the United States thousands and tens of thousands of liberal and enlightened men, who only require to have the fair and holy form of Truth placed before their eyes, properly authenticated, to induce them to clasp her to their bosoms. For such I write: and there is a large fund of consolation and encouragement to be derived from the consideration, that I address a public which has not any sordid motives of self-interest to impel it to uphold the cause of imposture. There is here no Protestant, nor Presbyterian, nor Quaker, nor Catholic, nor Universalist ascendency, whose power is built on the pestiferous basis of fraud, perjury, and misrepresentation.

This is an inestimable advantage, which writers on this subject, in the British dominions, cannot enjoy to the same extent. The power, influence, and ascendency of the "*sacred cast*," the Irish oligarchs who uphold the despotism of a dominant and domineering ecclesiastical establishment, which, to compensate them for their services, ensures them the undisturbed possession of all the honours and emoluments of society, would fall prostrate at the touch of the talisman of truth, as the gorgeous fabric of Aladdin's palace fell at the touch of the wand of the genius: and therefore, how disgraceful soever it may be to human nature, it is not wonderful, considering the weakness, the wickedness, and the selfishness of mankind, that so much pains should have been and are taken to stifle the voice of injurious truth, and to perpetuate the reign of productive and lucrative imposture.

Some gentlemen have exclaimed against this undertaking, as highly pernicious, and calculated to revive ancient prejudices and excite hostility between different denominations of Christians, and between the natives of the two British islands. Charity induces me to hope, that those who raise these objections are deceived, not deceivers,—that they believe what they profess. But that their impressions, if ingenuous, arise from a very contracted view of the subject, may be made as clear as any axiom in morals or politics.

There might be some plausibility in these objections, had the frauds and falsehoods I have

undertaken to expose and refute, sunk into oblivion, and their influence wholly ceased to operate. But they have unfortunately survived the causes which gave them birth; become engrafted in history; taken complete possession of the public mind; and are almost as thoroughly and as universally believed, as the best established facts in the annals of the world. Can the man, then, who honestly endeavours to demolish the fabric of deception, and, by this demolition, eradicate the angry passions which it has engendered, be regarded otherwise than as engaged in a laudable warfare,—the warfare of holy truth against impious imposture? Do not those who labour to prevent the success of such an undertaking, uphold the cause of fraud and delusion?

Having stated the motives to this undertaking, I submit to the consideration of the reader the several points which I have laboured, and I trust successfully, to establish. That they are of vital importance, and that, if proved, they invalidate a large portion of the history of Ireland, as narrated by Temple, Borlase, Carte, Warner, Leland, Hume, and others, will appear obvious, on a slight perusal. This consideration entitles them to a sober, serious examination.

It is not, by any means, pretended that they are discussed systematically, in the order in which they are here arranged. The proofs are dispersed throughout the work, and, notwithstanding their want of arrangement, cannot, I hope, fail to satisfy every candid mind,—

I. That the statement given by Temple, Clarendon, Warner, Leland, and all the other writers on the affairs of Ireland, that the Irish, for forty years previous to the insurrection of 1641, enjoyed a high degree of peace, security, happiness, and toleration, is as base and shameful a falsehood as ever disgraced the pages of history, and is no more like the real state of the case, than the history of St. George and the dragon is like the true history of England. For

II. That, during this period, there was hardly a Catholic in the kingdom who was secure in the possession of his property, or in the exercise of his religion. And

III. That, during the same period, the Irish were plundered by the government of nearly a million of acres of their lands, in the most wicked, unjust and perfidious manner; and by rapacious individuals, to an extent beyond calculation.

IV. That O'Conally's pretended discovery of a conspiracy, is one unvaried strain of perjury.

V. That there was no conspiracy for a general insurrection in Ireland, on the 23d October, 1641.

VI. That the basis on which rests the story of the pretended bloody massacre *by the Irish*, is a tissue of the most gross and palpable falsehood and perjury. On the contrary,

VII. That the massacres perpetrated *on the Irish*, by St. Leger, Monroe, Tichbourne, Hamilton, Grenville, Ireton, and Cromwell, were as savage, as ferocious, as brutal, and as bloody, as the horrible feats of Cortes or Pizarro, Attila or

Genghis Khan; and particularly, that history presents nothing more shocking or detestable than Ireton's butchery in the cathedral of Cashell, and Cromwell's in Drogheda.

VIII. That the Irish government issued a bloodthirsty and detestable order to slaughter "all men able to bear arms, in places where the insurgents were harboured," without any discrimination between the innocent and guilty; that the Long Parliament enacted an ordinance, "forbidding quarter to be given to any Irishman taken prisoner in England;" and that those cruel and wicked edicts were carried into operation.

IX. That the scheme of a general extirpation of the Irish, as general a confiscation of their estates, and a new plantation of the country, was most seriously entertained, and for some time acted upon, by the Irish rulers and their officers.

X. That the idea of a cessation of hostilities, whereby the Irish might escape from this projected plan of extirpation, excited as universal an alarm in England and Ireland, as if the established religion and government were to be wholly overturned.

XI. That the Irish government left nothing barbarous, cruel, or wicked, undone, to goad the Irish to resistance, and to extend the insurrection throughout the kingdom, for the purpose of enriching themselves and their friends by confiscations.

XII. That if the Irish insurgents of 1641 deserved to be stigmatized as traitors and rebels, then were the English revolutionists of 1688, the American of 1776, and the French of 1789, traitors and rebels of the very worst possible kind; as their grievances bore no more proportion to those of the Irish, than the gentle Schuylkill to the impetuous Mississippi, the hill of Howth to the peak of Teneriffe, or lake Erie to the Atlantic ocean.

XIII. That there is a striking contradiction between the facts and inductions of Carte, Warner, Leland, and nearly all the other writers of Irish history.

XIV. That, in the Anglo-Hibernian histories of Ireland, there is so much error and falsehood, established beyond the possibility of doubt or denial, that they are utterly unworthy of credit.

XV. That the seventeenth century, in the British dominions, was characterized by a succession of forged plots, resting on the basis of flagrant perjuries, and calculated to sacrifice the lives and property of the innocent, and enrich malefactors of the worst kind.

XVI. That the Irish code of laws, whose pretended object was "to prevent the growth of Popery," was intended to gratify all the basest passions of human nature, in violation of public faith, honour, justice, and humanity; and that it organized as tyrannical an invasion of liberty, and

as piratical a depredation on property, and was covered by as base a cloak of hypocrisy, as the annals of the world can produce.

---

I fondly flatter myself, I repeat, that the proofs I have adduced fully establish the whole of these points. But should I be too sanguine in this expectation, I still trust that I shall secure the assent of liberal and ingenuous minds to all the essential ones. Against the fortresses of fraud and imposture, I have brought a battery of eight-and-forty pounders, which can hardly fail to demolish them. The arsenals of enemies, some of them most envenomed, have furnished all the cannon. The laborious and unwearied research for them, and their mere disposition and arrangement, are all the merit I claim.

It would be a most fastidious and hypercritical delicacy, that should preclude a writer from fairly stating the merits of, and obviating objections to, his materials, or the authorities on which he relies to support his narrative, if he write history; or his discussions, if he investigate historical facts. I neither feel myself, nor fear in my readers, any such delicacy. I therefore treat on the materials of this publication, as I should on those of any other whatsoever.

I feel confident that there is probably no historical work extant, that rests on stronger grounds. I am not aware of a single fact of importance, throughout the whole, that is not

supported, not only by reference to, but, what is far more important, quotations from, indisputable authorities,—authorities generally hostile to the cause I espouse.

Dr. Curry, in his invaluable work, the "Historical and Critical Review of the Civil Wars in Ireland," has set a laudable example in this department of literature. He has, in most cases, established his facts by copious quotations. I have not merely followed, but have gone beyond his example. I have been more general in my quotations; and have but slenderly availed myself of the Irish writers: whereas a large portion of his authorities are of that description; and, although they are in themselves perfectly sound and unexceptionable, yet they are liable to cavil, for which I was determined to afford no pretext whatever. On such a question, Irish authorities would not have sufficient weight with minds devoured by prejudice; and would come before the world in a questionable form, and subject to suspicions of partiality. I have therefore almost wholly rejected them throughout; so that, in about five hundred quotations, there are not a dozen from writers of that class: and, in one of the most important chapters of the book, that on the subject of the massacres and murders perpetrated on the Irish, I have not made use of a single one of their advocates. In this respect, I believe the work rests on the most impregnable foundation; and am persuaded no similar instance ever occurred.

My heart swells with a glow of satisfaction and pride, that I can come before the critical world, with a defence of Ireland, resting on the names of Spencer, Davies, Coke, Temple, Borlase, Clarendon, Rushworth, Nalson, Carte, Warner, Leland, Baker, Orrery, &c. nearly all of whom were open or concealed enemies of that country and its unfortunate inhabitants. It may seem extraordinary, that there is on the list the name of the wretched Temple, who, as I have shown,* was so far ashamed of his own spurious work, that he endeavoured, but in vain, to suppress it: but it is the peculiar felicity of this undertaking, that it may be fairly said to this father of all the imposture,

"By thy words thou shalt be condemned."

for, were all the other authorities, cited in this work, totally annihilated, there is enough in this legendist to demolish the fabric of fraud and deception, in the erection of which, so much time, and such varied talents, have been pr stituted, for a hundred and fifty years past.

Having stated the motives to this undertaking; the points I have endeavoured to prove; and the materials I have employed, it remains to render some account of the execution of the plan: and here I confess I feel myself open to censure, from which I shall not attempt to shrink. The work is in a very imperfect state indeed; and

* Page 391.

has not had a due share of attention bestowed on it. Whether, by any degree of time and labour, I could have rendered it complete and perfect, I am very doubtful. But this is certain, that I might have made it far less imperfect, had I devoted more time to it. The great body of it has been written at night, when the pressure of usual avocations had subsided; and next day hastily committed to the press, under all the consequent disadvantages.

This statement is the offspring, not of ostentation, but of a due regard to truth, and in the faint hope that it will operate as some sort of apology for the manifest imperfections of the work. I am not, however, unaware, that, in strict justice, this avowal may be considered as rendering those imperfections more unpardonable; as it may with truth be said, that no man has a right to present his productions to the world, without due preparation; that it is disrespectful, and deserves severe censure; in a word, that the haste with which this vindication has been composed and hurried through the press, so far from being an extenuation, is an aggravation of the offence.

The correctness of these objections cannot be denied. But let it sink deep into the mind of the reader, that, whatever I may suffer from the justice, or even the utmost rigour, of criticism, is unimportant, compared with what I feel from the convictions of my own mind. I stand self-condemned. That I have not done justice to

myself, in presenting the work to the public in such an imperfect state, is of little importance. This might lower the sails of my vanity: but it could affect me alone. But, having undertaken the delightful task of vindicating the country of Swift, Parnell, Goldsmith, Sterne, Farquhar, Burke, Flood, Curran, Grattan, Montgomery, and a long and bright galaxy of such illustrious characters; a country whose natives, notwithstanding the countless blessings bestowed on them by Nature, in local situation, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate, have been for ages doomed to pine in the most abject poverty, wretchedness, and idleness, at home; but abroad, in every region and every clime of the known world, have displayed the brightest energies of the human character, in all the varied walks of life; a country which has furnished almost every nation in Christendom with statesmen and warriors, driven from their native soil by lordly despotism, rampant injustice, and religious intolerance;* a country

* *Extract from an unanimous Address, agreed to by the Federal members of the legislature of Maryland, published in consequence of the Baltimore riots.*

"A dependency of Great Britain, *Ireland has long languished under oppressions reprobated by humanity, and discountenanced by just policy.* It would argue penury of human feeling, and ignorance of human rights, *to submit patiently to those oppressions. Centuries have witnessed the struggles of Ireland*, but with only partial success. Rebellions and insurrections have continued, with but short intervals of tranquillity. Many of the Irish, like the French, are the hereditary foes of Great

which has produced the men on whom the destinies of Europe have recently depended, in the field and in the cabinet; a country the most calumniated, and among the most oppressed, in the world; having as fair a field to explore as ever courted the exertions of any writer, in any age or any country, I most deeply regret, and sincerely apologize for, the want of judgment which led me to appear precipitately before the public, without that degree of elaboration which the importance of the subject demanded.

Having candidly avowed thus much with respect to the execution of the work, I trust I shall not be censured for expressing a hope, that there is, in the object I have had in view; the glorious cause I have undertaken; and the impregnable basis on which this vindication rests, a redeeming virtue, that would atone for defects and imperfections infinitely greater than those to be found in these pages. He must be a most fastidious epicure, who, when hungry, would turn in scorn from excellent viands, merely because the *traiteur* had been injudicious or inexpert in the cookery: and the reader would be equally injudicious, who should reject a work which

Britain. *America has opened her arms to the oppressed of all nations.* No people have availed themselves of the asylum with more alacrity, or in greater numbers, than the Irish. *High is the meed of praise, rich the reward, which Irishmen have merited from the gratitude of America.* AS HEROES AND STATESMEN, THEY HONOUR THEIR ADOPTED COUNTRY."

shed the broad glare of truth on an important and much-misrepresented period of history, merely because, from want of skill, or want of leisure, or perhaps both, the writer had failed in the arrangement of his materials.

Some readers may complain, that the quotations are too numerous; that they disfigure the appearance of the work; and unnecessarily enhance its volume: and some may be unjust enough to believe that the latter is one of the objects of the writer.

Whoever entertains this idea must be grossly ignorant of the nature of writing. He has never tried the experiment. The search for some of those passages, which do not exceed three or four lines, has cost more time and labour than have been employed in writing five or six pages. In fact, the time wasted in examining the dry and dreary details of a soporific volume of Thurloe's State Papers, of eight or nine hundred pages, where hardly a single fact was to be gleaned, would have sufficed for writing a chapter of original matter.

In some cases, however, I have probably given more quotations than were necessary: but this error is venial. Those who are satisfied with one or two authorities, out of six or eight, may pass over the remainder: whereas the contrary and common error, of affording slender support to what we are ourselves, and suppose others, convinced of, is a vital one. A single

instance of the latter is productive of more injurious consequences than twenty of the former.

For the exuberance of quotations, an adequate reason can be given. In the gross adulteration of Irish history, which we have had occasion so often to present to the reader, it requires no ordinary weight of proof, to make an impression on the public mind, on points wherein error is so gross, truth so little known, means of correct information so limited, and prejudice so inveterate.

Of what avail would it be, had I written a narrative of the events discussed in this work, even with a long series of references to my authorities? Who, to verify the facts, would take the pains to explore Temple, and Borlase, and Rushworth, and Baker, and Clarendon, and Carte, and Leland, and Warner, and so many other writers whom I have quoted? Not one in a hundred. The facts would be regarded as resting on the writer's mere ipse dixit; and would wholly fail to produce the effect intended, and which I trust the work will produce. But lives there a man who will dare to refuse his assent, when I quote Ludlow, for the butchery at Cashel; the marquis of Ormond, and Cromwell himself, for that at Drogheda; Borlase, for the starvation of "7,000 of the vulgar sort," by one regiment; Rushworth, for the bloodthirsty decree of the Long Parliament, "to give no quarter to Irish prisoners;" and the lords justices them-

selves, for the murderous order to "kill every man able to bear arms, in those places where rebels were harboured?"

On this subject I desire to be distinctly understood. Though literary reputation, to every man who employs his pen for the public, must be a desirable object; yet I should be more highly gratified, were this vindication a mere collection of "shreds and patches," without a single page of my own composition, and in which my sole merit would arise from the research for, and arrangement of, facts, forcing conviction on the reader's mind, than if it united the manly boldness of Tacitus with the elaborate elegance of Gibbon, (if those qualities be not incompatible) but were as deceptious and fraudulent as Clarendon's account of the state of Ireland previous to 1641, or Hume's of the insurrection of that year. Wretched, indeed, and meriting pity and contempt, must be the man who could hesitate for a moment between the two results of his labours.

In following the track of such an indefatigable writer as Curry, who has almost exhausted the sickening subject, it would be hardly possible to avoid using the same materials, and frequently making analogous dispositions of, and deductions from, them. This is the fate of every writer who travels over ground already beaten. A man who writes history, or discusses historical subjects, of remote periods, is no further worthy of credit,

than as he narrates facts already recorded. Invention and fraud are synonymous terms. All that remain for modern writers, who treat of remote events, are, laborious research; judicious selection of materials; fidelity of quotation; and correct induction. How far I have succeeded with the second and fourth, the world will decide: but to the first and third I fearlessly lay claim. I have spared neither pains nor expense in procuring the necessary materials, nor time nor labour in their examination. Almost every book in the Philadelphia library, bearing on this subject, (and the number is immense) I have examined; and moreover procured many, which it does not contain, from New York, Baltimore, and Burlington.*

* It is not pretended, that I have read all the books I have quoted. Half a life would hardly be adequate to this purpose. No man of business could read Thurloe and Rushworth, amounting to fifteen ponderous folios, in less than two or three years. But four-fifths of the books to which I have referred, and many which were too barren to afford a single passage, I have examined page by page. Others have been more slightly searched; and of some, only certain volumes, on cotemporaneous events. Those accustomed to investigations of this kind, know that a single glance will frequently suffice to ascertain whether a page be likely to furnish suitable matter. This has been remarkably the case with Thurloe, Rushworth and Clarendon. Temple, Carte, Warner, Leland, and some others, who have furnished the principal part of my materials, required a closer examination, which they have accordingly received. But of the matter suitable for my purpose, even in these works, a large portion must have wholly escaped me, from the rapidity of my researches. Moreover, of my selections, I have not been able to avail myself of more than one-fourth part, in consequence of the limits I prescribed to this work.

On the subject of fidelity of quotation, I wish to state, that I have been as careful as human frailty would admit, to avoid errors: but, in the very unusual number of authorities, some may have crept in. If this be the case, I am satisfied they are few and unimportant. Should any be discovered, I shall regard the communication of them as a signal favour.

I have been led to notice slightly, and merely as connected with the subject, some of the proceedings of the Long Parliament and of Charles I. In this, as in all other cases of civil war, there were egregious and multifarious "faults on both sides," some of which truth has called upon me to state. Zealous friends of free government, who have been nurtured in idolatry of the Long Parliament, which they regard as immaculate, will hardly pardon a writer who holds them up to execration, for their "*no quarter*" ordinance; for their rancorous opposition to a cessation of arms; and for their devouring rage for the extermination of the Irish, and the confiscation of their estates: and the idolaters of the "*royal martyr*" will equally denounce me, for daring to expose his base perfidy to the Irish. This result has been foreseen, and is disregarded. They may censure and abuse as much as they will: but volumes of such censure and abuse will not disprove a single fact.

When this work was about two-thirds printed, I met with a most excellent history of Ireland, by

John Lawless, Esqr. published anno 1814, wherein the writer defends his country's character and rights, in an unusually bold, eloquent, masterly, and overwhelming manner. Having derived his materials from the same sources as Curry, sources to which I also have had recourse, it is not wonderful that there should frequently be a sameness between his work and this. I am gratified to state, that there is a coincidence between his views of most of the subjects, and those I have taken, particularly with respect to the rapacity and plunder of James I. I regret, however, to find, that he has very slightly passed over the two most important points embraced in this work: I mean the account of the pretended general conspiracy, and the legends of the massacre of 1641, which his powerful pen could have so ably exposed, and for the detection of which he must have had more copious materials in Dublin than I could procure in Philadelphia. This elegant and interesting history ought to be in the possession of every Irishman who feels for the honour and glory of his country.

The strong language of reprobation, which I have used towards the English administrations in Ireland, will probably excite the ire of some unthinking Englishmen, who may regard it as a libel on their nation. Such feelings can be entertained only by most illiberal minds. Every enlightened Englishman will sympathize in the horrible sufferings of Ireland, and consign to

infamy the memory of those oppressors, whose rapine and cruelty inflicted so much misery on so fair a portion of the globe, and pursued a system so well adapted to eternize hostility between the two nations, and which had not a single feature calculated to secure the attachment of a people who, easily alienated by hostility, are proverbially celebrated for being as easily conciliated by kindness as any in the world.

But the dreadful scenes exhibited in Ireland were not the result of any peculiarity in the English nation: they arose from the relations between the two islands. Perhaps, had the case been wholly reversed,—had Ireland been the master nation, Irishmen would have

> " Play'd such fantastic tricks before high heaven,
> As make e'en angels weep,"

and run riot in England, as Englishmen have done in Ireland: for, if there be one truth more clearly proved by history than another, it is, that bodies of men, or nations, are demons, when they have uncontrolled power over other bodies or nations. All the oppressions, the tyrannies, the rapines, the bloody persecutions, that load the polluted and wretched annals of mankind, bear the most irrefragable evidence to this appalling position.

The English, for two hundred years, have commemorated, with horror against the Dutch, the massacre at Amboyna; the statement of the atrocity of which bears the strongest marks of gross

exaggeration and falsehood: for who can allow himself to believe the tale, that "*the tortured wretches were forced to drink water till their bodies were distended to the utmost pitch, and then caused to disgorge the water, and the process repeated;*" that they "*were burned, from the feet upwards, in order to extort the confession of a conspiracy;*" that "*the nails of their fingers and toes were torn off;*" or, finally, that "*holes were made in their breasts, and the cavities filled with inflammable matter?*"* No man of common sense can pay a moment's attention to it. Yet this is the precise story, as it stands recorded. A rancorous hostility prevailed between the English and the Dutch: and it is by no means improbable, that the conspiracy charged upon the former by the latter was real, and that the conspirators were justly and regularly punished. All the rest of the story, I repeat, has the most manifest and palpable appearance of exaggeration and embellishment, contrived for the purpose of rendering the Dutch odious. This is the more probable, from a consideration of the lying spirit of that age, of which I have given so many striking instances.

But suppose the story of "the massacre of Amboyna" true; suppose all those horrid deeds were really perpetrated: ten thousand such scenes would fall incalculably short of the sufferings inflicted on the Irish, in the Desmond war, or the

* Encyclopædia Perthensis, I. 561.

insurrection of 1641: and, in truth, the whole legend fades into insignificance, compared with the single fact of the butchery at Drogheda.

Let any candid, fair, and honourable Englishman, therefore, lay his hand on his heart, and say whether he can justify himself for censuring an Irishman for mourning over the melancholy story of his country's sufferings; for vindicating her character; and for attempting to remove the mountains of obloquy and abuse with which wicked men have overwhelmed her for centuries? The Englishman feels deeply for the honour of his country. Why should he condemn, why should he not rather applaud, the same feeling in an Irishman? Has not an Irishman, like an Englishman,

> "Senses, affections, passions? Is he not fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as" an Englishman? "If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not" defend ourselves?

---

My requisitions on the reader are few and simple. I merely request a candid and patient hearing; that no inveterate prejudice may be allowed to operate against me; and that the "Vindiciæ Hibernicæ" may not be arraigned at the bar of criticism as if it were injudiciously offered to the world as a regular, systematic, finished work, to which it explicitly declines making

any pretensions,—but rather as a series of distinct and somewhat desultory chapters, tending to prove certain points, each insulated from the rest. To this view I request the most particular attention; and that it may be constantly borne in mind, throughout the perusal of the work. I court and defy the most rigorous scrutiny into my facts and inductions. Let no mercy be shown to those on which there is the least doubt or uncertainty: let all be rejected, that do not carry with them irresistible conviction. If, in the ardent zeal I feel in what I deem the noblest of causes, I have occasionally over-rated the force of the evidence, and drawn conclusions which that evidence does not appear to warrant, on some particular points, and if my positions on those be rejected, I trust that this decision will not affect any of the others. Let each stand forth substantively by itself, and not bring on the downfal of its neighbour by its error, or support its neighbour's error by its truth.

Pecuniary considerations have had no place among the motives that led to this undertaking. This edition consists of only seven hundred and fifty copies, of which two hundred and fifty are intended to be gratuitously distributed to public libraries, reading-rooms, and enlightened individuals; in order to afford the work a fair chance of perusal, and my calumniated country an opportunity of justification. While that number

lasts, any library company, sending an order for a copy, shall be supplied, without expense. Agents shall be appointed, to distribute the books, on this plan, in Boston, New York, Baltimore, &c.

P. S. One passage of this work will justify a further trespass on the reader's attention.

In page 31, I have quoted Milton, as stating that there were above 600,000 Protestants massacred in Ireland, during the insurrection of 1641:

"The rebellion and horrid massacre of English Protestants in Ireland, to the amount of 154,000 in the province of Ulster only, by their own computation; *which, added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter, in all likelihood, four times as great.*"

This extract is taken from his "Iconoclastes," *second edition*, page 49. There are, however, in the Philadelphia library, two editions of Milton's works complete, dated 1738 and 1753, in both of which the latter part of the passage, in italics, is omitted.

This discrepancy requires explanation. I have taken the citation of Milton from "Harris's Historical Account of the Lives and Writings of James I. and Charles I."* in these words:

"Milton, *in the second edition of his Iconoclastes*, has the following passage: 'The rebellion and horrid massacre,'" &c. verbatim, as before.

* Vol. II. p. 391, London, 1814.

We are therefore reduced to this dilemma:—either Milton stated the falsehood, as above quoted, or Harris was guilty of a base fraud and literary forgery: but, as he was a man of respectable character, and as, moreover, his work, which is of modern date, has passed the ordeal of criticism in England, the latter supposition cannot be admitted. The only conclusion that follows, is, that the passage is fairly quoted by Harris; and that Milton, ashamed of the monstrous and extravagant legend, to which he had lent the sanction of his name, struck it out, after the second edition of his work. This recantation extenuates the crime, but by no means does away the original guilt of the criminal.

# CONTENTS.

# VINDICIÆ HIBERNICÆ.

## CHAPTER I.

"Uncertain, mistaken, false, and contradictory accounts have been given of the Irish Rebellion, by writers influenced by selfish views and party animosities."[1]

"Their enemies and competitors were indefatigable in endeavouring to load their whole party with the guilt of new conspiracies; (A) and even (B) *manifest forgeries were received as solid proofs.*"[2]

*Historical writing. Its difficulties extreme. Discrepancies and falsehoods. Irish history more difficult, and more replete with fraud, than any other. President and Little Belt.*

OF all the modes of employing the intellectual powers of man for the benefit of the great family to which he belongs, there is probably none superior, in its beneficial tendency, to history, properly executed. When thus executed, and judiciously studied, it is fraught with advantages of the most signal kind. Its operation in the moral, bears a strong analogy to that of the sun in the natural world. It sheds beneficent rays of light around, and dispels those mists of darkness which

[1] Carte, III. Preface. [2] Leland, IV. 131.

bewilder the traveller, and obscure his path. It unerringly points out, to governments and people, the career of rectitude and of safety. The wisdom and folly of our ancestors, placed before our eyes, admonish us the course we ought to pursue, the conduct we ought to shun ; and the most characteristic difference between a sound and a pettifogging statesman, is, that the warning voice of history has its due share of influence over the former, while it sounds in vain in the ears of the latter.

But when this species of writing is made subservient to the sinister purposes of a party or faction—when servile fear induces a writer to calculate his work to palliate their enormities, or to perpetuate their power—when wicked and profligate men, who ought to be held up to the execration of mankind, are pourtrayed as objects of esteem and veneration—when actions worthy of gibbets and guillotines, are blazoned forth as proofs of patriotism and public spirit—when fraud and falsehood guide the pen—or indolence bars the entrance into those stores, whence alone the truth can be derived,—then the valuable purposes of history are perverted—the fountains of correct information corrupted and poisoned—an undue bias is given to the public mind, as well as to that of individuals—other pernicious consequences are produced—and the guilty authors have a fair and indisputable claim to the most unqualified censure.

Under this censure fall the major part of those who have written on the affairs of Ireland, whether in the imposing form of histories, or political pamphlets, and anniversary sermons.[C] The leading object with most of them has been to fan and foster the most illiberal and unfounded prejudices,—to support and justify the oppression of a lordly aristocracy, who, for a century and a half, have, with the most unfeeling tyranny, rode rough-shod over the great mass of the nation,[D]—and to hold up that mass as objects of abhorrence. There are exceptions: a few writers have dared to utter bold truths, however unpalatable to this aristocracy. But it is a melancholy fact, that so inveterate has Prejudice been on these topics, and so difficult to shake off her iron yoke, that some of the best-intentioned writers on Irish affairs have fallen into many of the most egregious errors of their predecessors.

I shall give one instance, though rather out of place here. The fairest and most upright English historian of the calamitous period of the civil war of 1641, is the Rev. Ferdinando Warner. He has, however, fallen into very great errors. In the account, for instance, which he gives of the massacre (as it is termed) of 1641, he colours as highly, and uses almost as extravagant terms, as those who asserted that there were one hundred and fifty-four thousand murdered in three months; or as others, who carried the number to three hundred thousand; or as Milton.[E] who extends it

to above six hundred thousand![F] And yet, wonderful to tell, when, towards the close of his work, he goes into the examination of the evidence, he finds it so ridiculous and inadmissible, that he rejects by far the greater part of it, and reduces the whole number murdered to about four thousand. Thus, his facts not only do not warrant his inferences, but absolutely destroy them; for it is perfectly obvious, that if there were but four thousand murdered, the numberless cruelties he so elaborately portrays could not possibly have taken place.

"There is no credit to be given to any thing that was said by these people; which had not others' evidence to confirm it: and the reason why so many *idle silly tales were registered, of what this body heard another body say*, as to swell the collection to two-and-thirty thick volumes, in folio, closely written, it is easier to conjecture,[G] than it is to commend."[3]

"Setting aside all opinions and calculations in this affair, which, besides their uncertainty, are without any precision as to the space of time in which the murders were committed, the evidence, from the depositions in the manuscript above mentioned, stands thus:—The number of people killed, upon positive evidence, collected in two years after the insurrection broke out, adding them all together, amounts only to *two thousand one hundred and nine;* on the reports of other Protestants, *one thousand six hundred and nineteen more;* and on the report of some of the rebels themselves, a further number of *three hundred;* the whole making *four thousand and twenty-eight.* Besides these murders, there is, in the same collection, evidence, on the report of others, of eight thousand killed by bad usage: and if we should allow that the cruelties of the

[3] Warner, 146.

Irish, out of war, extended to these numbers, which, considering the nature of several of the depositions, *I think in my conscience we cannot*, yet to be impartial we must allow, that *there is no pretence for laying a greater number to their charge.* This account is also corroborated by a letter, which I copied out of the Council Books at Dublin, written on the fifth of May, sixteen hundred and fifty-two, ten years after the beginning of the rebellion, from the Parliament Commissioners in Ireland to the English Parliament. After exciting them to further severity against the Irish, as being afraid "their behaviour towards this people may never sufficiently avenge their murders and massacres, and lest the Parliament might shortly be in pursuance of a speedy settlement of this nation, and thereby some tender concessions might be concluded," the Commissioners tell them that it appears "*besides eight hunhundred forty-eight families, there were killed, hanged, burned, and drowned, six thousand and sixty-two.*"[4]

These paragraphs, written by an enlightened and independent Protestant historian, after an elaborate investigation of the subject, and with every conceivable advantage for eliciting truth from the mass of falsehood and perjury with which it had been previously overwhelmed for a century, are amply adequate to sink into contempt, and to bury in eternal oblivion, the fabulous accounts of nearly all the other historians, who have made the welkin ring with the tremendous romances of massacres.

I shall, in the course of this work, collect various instances of a similar discrepancy, which abound in the histories of Irish affairs.

In the whole range of history, there is not probably a period that holds out stronger inducements for discussion, that affords a more fertile

[4] Warner, 297.

field, but that is attended with more difficulty,[H] than that of Ireland, during the first half of the seventeenth century, to which I principally wish to call the attention of the reader.

But the sinister views or the indolence of historians, are by no means the only rocks on which history, so far as its noble and legitimate purposes are concerned, is in danger of shipwreck. There are others, equally formidable. With the most enlightened mind, and the purest intentions, the task of the historian is extremely arduous; and he will, for want of proper charts, be occasionally, perhaps frequently, driven upon the shoals and quicksands of error and falsehood. So much of the real character of events, and of the actors in them, depends on numberless minute circumstances, which elude observation, or are liable to most extravagant misconception, that it is obvious, historians are often obliged to substitute conjecture for fact; and hence profound observers have styled histories "splendid romances;" which designation unfortunately applies to a large portion of them.

In the accounts given of the same occurrences, by cotemporaneous writers, of adverse parties or hostile nations, there is often such a total discrepancy, that they hardly agree in any thing but the dates, and the names of persons and places: were these stricken out, it could not be conceived that the narratives had reference to the same events. And the most disgusting and awful trait

in the affair is, that these contradictory and irreconcilable accounts are frequently bolstered up, on both sides, by the solemnity of appeals to heaven, in the form of oaths, taken by persons, who, from their standing in society, ought to be above the suspicion, not merely of perjury, but of the slightest departure from truth.

As one appropriate example is of more avail than a long train of reasoning, I wish to call the reader's attention to a striking and recent case, which places the difficulty I have stated in the strongest point of light, and cannot fail to impress him with a clear idea of its serious importance. On the 16th of May, 1811, a rencontre took place between two vessels of war, American and English, the President and Little Belt, in which the latter lost a number of men, and was in imminent danger of sinking. In every material fact, the accounts of the commanders were entirely different; and to such an extravagant degree, that there is no room to ascribe the discordance to mistake. There must have been clear, deliberate, and disgraceful falsehood on one side or the other. There is no other alternative.

Commodore Rodgers stated, that he hailed first,—that his inquiries, what was the name of the vessel, &c. were returned by similar inquiries,—and that, when he repeated his hail, he was saluted by a shot, which he of course returned:—that then three others were fired by

the Little Belt, which were followed by the rest of her broadside, and all her musketry;—that he then "*gave a general order to fire*," which, in "from *four to six* minutes," partially silenced the guns of his antagonist, and induced the commodore to order a cessation of firing;—that, in four minutes, the fire was renewed by the Little Belt, and returned by the President with so much effect, that the gaff and colours of the former were down, his mainsail-yard upon the cap, and his fire silenced.[I]

Captain Bingham, on the contrary, stated, that he first hailed the President, of which there was no notice taken;—that he was hailed afterwards by that vessel, which accompanied the inquiry with "*a broadside*," which was "instantly returned." He adds, "the action then became general, and continued for *three quarters of an hour*, when the President ceased firing, and appeared to be on fire." "He was," he adds, "obliged to desist from firing," that is to say, from the attack on the President, as the latter vessel "falling off," his guns "would not bear on her."[K] The inference is not overstrained, that he wished it to be understood that the President had escaped from him.

The discrepancy here is extreme. Each party charges the other with the original offence of the aggression. This is all-important. And the American commander states, that, in the first instance, he silenced the Little Belt in from

four to six minutes,—and, in the second, in from three to five: whereas, according to captain Bingham, the action continued "*three quarters of an hour*," and was discontinued by commodore Rodgers, whose vessel was on fire;—and he was disabled from pursuing the President, in consequence of the state of his sails and rigging. To cap the climax, the depositions of a number of the officers and men on both sides were taken, and appeared to confirm these contradictory accounts; so that to gross and revolting falsehood, is added barefaced perjury, on one side or the other. It is wholly irrelevant to my purpose to inquire where the falsification rested. Subsequent events, however, have shed adequate light upon the subject.

To this strong and pointed case, I invite the most serious attention of the reader. To the falsehood and perjury involved in it, there were no very extraordinary temptations, particularly to the perjury. It might have been of great importance, indeed, to the aggressor, to exonerate himself from the criminality of the aggression, in order to escape the danger of being cashiered: but the officers and men had no such temptation; nor is it easy to perceive what temptation they could have had to the commission of such a heinous offence.

I had intended to adduce other cases in point:[1] but I forbear. I feel convinced, that no analogous facts, how strong soever, could enhance the

cogency of the inferences deducible from this incident. There is one point of view in which it may be regarded, that ought not to be overlooked. In the present state of printing, and the open, unreserved communication between nations, fraud and falsehood can hardly flatter themselves to escape detection. This consideration must have powerful operation to circumscribe and restrain them, and was almost wholly unknown in former times, when of course the inducements to fraud and perjury were so far greater than they are at present.

The application remains, and can hardly fail to have been anticipated by the reader. Notwithstanding the slenderness of the temptation to perjury, and the absolute certainty of detection, it was, we see, flagrantly committed in this case. What a lesson on history generally—but more especially on Irish history! What dependence, under this view of the materials from which history is formed, can be placed on the accounts of the affairs of that nation, which are wholly ex parte—where the temptations were so enormous, (being nothing less than the fee simple of millions of acres) where detection was so difficult, and where numberless palpable perjuries are on record?

## NOTES ON CHAPTER I.

[A] P. 17. *New Conspiracies.*] It is far from extravagant to state, that at various periods, wholly exclusive of the rebellion of 1641, millions of acres of the soil of Ireland have been forfeited for pretended plots and conspiracies, which were a never-failing source of rapine upon, and oppression of, the natives. In a future chapter, I shall state some of them in detail. Nothing could exceed the wickedness of the contrivers, except the clumsiness of the contrivances. Anonymous letters, dropped in the castle of Dublin, accusing of treason noblemen and gentlemen of large estates, were one of the principal levers by which this machinery of plots and conspiracies was put into operation.

[B] P. 17. *Manifest forgeries were received as solid proofs.*] This line, a fair description of the histories of Ireland, ought to be prefixed, as a motto, to four-fifths of them, as a necessary admonition, a sort of beacon, equivalent to "*Traveller, beware.*" Never, since the world was formed, did "*manifest forgery,*" fraud, and perjury prevail to such an extent, as in the evidence taken to establish the Irish massacre, as it is termed; never were "*manifest forgeries*" so readily received as "*solid proofs.*" The specimens I shall lay before the reader, must convince

the most sceptical, that this massacre is perfectly on a level, for truth and probability, with the Arabian Nights Entertainments, or the aunciente travayles of John Mandeville, yclept the knight of lying memory. The astonishing feature in this affair is, that Leland, thus convinced of the existence of these "*manifest forgeries*," should himself, through a large portion of his history, receive those very "*manifest forgeries*" as "*solid proofs.*"

[c] P. 19. *Anniversary sermons.*] For above a century and a half, the talents of numbers of clergymen of the established church in Ireland have been in requisition, to perpetuate and increase the rancour and hostility that are instilled from the cradle into the tender minds of the different denominations of Protestants against their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, which they carry from the cradle to the grave, many of them across an ocean three thousand miles in extent. The store-house, whence are derived these incendiary weapons, has been the "thirty-two volumes" of depositions, in which, according to Dr. Leland, "*manifest forgeries were received as solid proofs.*" If "blessed be the peace makers," surely the sowers of discord must be accursed.

[D] P. 19. *Rode rough-shod.*] This refers to the barbarous and piratical code, enacted for the purpose of "*preventing the growth of Popery,*"

a system admirably calculated to oppress and impoverish, as well as to brutalize and demoralize, the mass of the nation, and enslave them to the aristocracy or oligarchy that ruled the land. A chapter or two shall be devoted to the development of this system.

[F] P. 20. Few, even of the learned, know this fact respecting Milton, which displays such an awful disregard of truth, as attaches an eternal blot on his memory. The reader may readily conceive what poignant distress was excited by the discovery of a procedure so diametrically opposite to the general character of Milton, whom we are taught, from infancy, to regard as ranking among the best of men. But, after all, it only adds one to the numberless proofs already before the world, of the fallibility of human nature, and evinces that he was but a mere man, and, so far as respects this case, either grossly deceived, or a gross deceiver;—there is no other alternative: and a liberal examination will more readily incline us to place in the latter than in the former class, the man who could, in cold blood, to pander to the purposes of a party, intimate an opinion, that there were above *six hundred thousand Protestants massacred* in Ireland, at a period when the whole population was not many more than a million, and when the Protestants were but *as two to eleven of the Roman Catholics.*[5] *Ainsi va le monde.*

[5] Petty, 18.

[G] P. 20. *It is easier to conjecture.*] This sentence exhibits a manifest dereliction of the duty of an historian. Warner had before him the plain fact, that the mass of testimony was doubled or trebled by the admission of hearsay evidence, "*what this body heard another body say:*"[6] and there was no difficulty in ascertaining the object, which the historian ought to have stated. This object was to criminate the Catholics, sacrifice them on gibbets, and confiscate their property. That this was Dr. Warner's "*conjecture*," cannot be doubted. The phraseology admits of no other construction. But it is merely insinuated, in a manner unworthy of so very respectable an historian.

[H] P. 22. *Attended with more difficulty.*] This difficulty requires explanation. The power and influence of the oligarchy in Ireland, which triumphantly styles itself, "*the Protestant ascendency*," have been erected on the basis of the frauds of this portion of the history of Ireland, whereby they have been enabled to enslave, oppress, and destroy their fellow subjects at their pleasure: and "Great is the Diana of Ephesus," whenever the "*craft was in danger*," by any serious effort to dispel the mists of prejudice, they have spared neither pains nor expense to counteract the Godlike purpose. Their most sacred maxim, like that of all other oppressors, has been —*Divide et impera.*

[6] Warner, ubi supra.

[L] P. 25. *Other cases in point.*] Two cis-Atlantic cases, of recent discussion, afford abundant matter for reflection. They are, the battle of Bunker's Hill, and the capture of major Andre. The opinions that have heretofore universally prevailed, respecting the conduct of general Putnam in the former, and on the character and motives of the captors of the unfortunate major, have been of late brought into controversy, and debated with great zeal and ardour. On the latter question, the opinion, so honourable to the parties, as well as to their country, whereby the procedure is rendered so invaluable and beneficial to the world in point of example, has been unanimously confirmed by the public. But with respect to general Putnam, the question appears to be *adhuc sub judice*, after having slept for above forty years. So much for history, even under its most favourable aspects! What must it be under its worst?

---

## PROOFS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

[E] P. 20. "The rebellion and horrid massacre of English protestants in Ireland, to the number of one hundred and fifty-four thousand in the province of Ulster only, by their own computation; which, added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter, *in all likelihood*, four times as great;"[7] that is, above *six hundred thousand massacred* in a few months, by insurgents, who, except in two or three instances, were uniformly defeated, and slaughtered without mercy!

[7] Milton's Iconoclastes, second edition, p. 49.

[1] P. 24. *Extract from the despatches of Commodore Rodgers to the Secretary of the Navy, dated May* 23, 1811.

"At fifteen or twenty minutes past eight, being a little forward of her weather beam, and distant from seventy to a hundred yards, hailed, "What ship is that?" To this inquiry no answer was given: but I was hailed by her commander, and asked, "What ship is that?" Having asked the first question, I of course considered myself entitled, by the common rules of politeness, to the first answer. After a pause of fifteen or twenty seconds, I reiterated my first inquiry of, "What ship is that?" and before I had time to take the trumpet from my mouth, was answered by a shot, that cut off one of our main-top back-stays, and went into our main-mast. At this instant, captain Caldwell (of marines) who was standing very near me, on the gangway, having observed, "Sir, she has fired at us," caused me to pause. Just as I was in the act of giving an order to fire a shot in return, and before I had time to resume the repetition of the intended order, a shot was actually fired from the second division of this ship, and was scarcely out of the gun, before it was answered from our assumed enemy, *by three others*, *in quick succession*, and soon after *by the rest of his broadside and musketry.* When the first shot was fired, being under an impression that it might possibly have proceeded from accident, and without the orders of the commander, I had determined, at the moment, to fire only a single shot in return; but the immediate repetition of the previous unprovoked outrage induced me to believe that the insult was premeditated; and that, from our adversary being at that time as ignorant of our real force as I was of his, he thought this, perhaps, a favourable opportunity of acquiring promotion, although at the expense of violating our neutrality, and insulting our flag. I accordingly, with that degree of repugnance incident to feeling, equally determined neither to be the aggressor, nor suffer the flag of my country to be insulted with impunity, gave a general order to fire; the effect of which, *in from four to six minutes*, as near as I can judge, having produced a partial silence of his guns, I gave orders to cease firing, discovering, by the feeble opposition, that it must be a ship of very inferior force to what I had supposed; or that some untoward accident had happened to her.

"My orders, in this instance, however, (although they proceeded alone from motives of humanity, and a determination not to spill a drop of blood unnecessarily,) I had, in less than four minutes, some reason to regret; as he renewed his fire, of which two thirty-two pound shot cut off one of our fore shrouds, and injured our foremast. It was now that I found myself under the painful necessity of giving orders for a repetition of our fire, against a force which our forbearance alone had enabled to do us any injury of moment. Our fire was accordingly renewed, and continued from *three to five minutes* longer, when, perceiving our opponent's gaff and colours down, his maintopsail-yard upon the cap, and his fire silenced, although it was so dark, that I could not discern any other particular injury we had done, or how far he was in a situation to do us further harm, I nevertheless embraced the earliest moment to stop our fire, and prevent the further effusion of blood."

[K] P. 24. *Extract of a letter from Captain Arthur Batt Bingham to Admiral Sawyer, dated May* 21, 1811.

"The ship was brought to, her colours hoisted, her guns double-shotted, and every preparation made in case of a surprise. By his manner of steering down, he evidently wished to lay his ship in a position for raking, which I frustrated, by wearing three times. About fifteen minutes past eight, he came within hail. I hailed, and asked, What ship that was? he *again repeated my words, and fired a broadside*, which I instantly returned. The action then became general, and *continued so for three quarters of an hour, when he ceased firing, and seemed to be on fire* about the main-hatchway. He then filled. *I was obliged to desist from firing*, as the ship falling off, no gun would bear, and had no after sail to keep her to, all the rigging and sails cut to pieces; not a brace nor a bow-line left. He hailed, and asked what ship this was: I told him. He then asked me if I had struck my colours? my answer, No: and asked what ship it was? as plain as I could understand, (he having shot some distance at this time) he answered, The United States' frigate. He fired no more guns, but stood from us, giving no reason for his most extraordinary conduct."

## CHAPTER II.

"Who should be trusted, when one's own right hand
Is perjured to the bosom?"——*Shakspeare.*

*Subject continued. Sir John Temple. The age of miracles revived. Bodies, after being six weeks drowned, rising en masse from the bed of a river. A man cut and hacked, and his entrails taken out, without bleeding. Watery ghosts screaming for revenge for three months.*

IN such cases of discrepancy as that of the President and Little Belt, (and similar ones are to be found on almost every topic of importance) how can even a cotemporary historian, with very considerable advantages, decide between them? He can have been an eye-witness of few of the events he narrates. For all the rest, he must necessarily depend on the accounts of others. He must either rely on one side or the other, or blend the two accounts together. In either case, error appears, as already observed, absolutely inevitable. And even of those events in which the writer has himself been a party, he must derive much of his information from others. An officer, who has been engaged in a battle, can have had but a limited view of the passing events. Armies sometimes occupy miles square; and therefore small is the portion that can be accurately surveyed by any individual.

If this view be correct, as I think can hardly be disputed, even so far as respects history written with a sincere regard to truth, and a fixed and unalterable determination not to swerve, intentionally, from her luminous path, how deplorable must be the case with histories, of which the original authors were under the influence of all the hideous passions that deform and degrade human nature, and assimilate men to demons—bigotry,[A] dire insatiable rancour, national hostility, a ravenous thirst for the blood[B] and estates[C] of the natives,—and where the modern authors are servile copyists, who implicitly follow in the beaten and foul path of their predecessors !

Almost all the writers of Irish history, down to Sir John Temple, were precisely in this situation, under the influence often of the whole, but never free from the goadings of some, of those dire passions. They were the historians of their own exploits, and pursued the horrible system of policy which led Rome to the establishment of her grinding tyranny over the greater part of the then known world,—and which has laid the populous and once mighty empire of Hindostan prostrate at the feet of a small body of merchants in Leadenhall street. The unfortunate natives of Ireland, as well the descendants of the Strongbows, the Butlers, the Courcys, the Fitzstephenses, the Fitzgeralds,[D] the Raymonds, and the Lacys, as the aboriginals of the country, were, under the most absurd pretexts, almost constant-

ly goaded into insurrection: every spark of discord between rival chieftains was fanned into a flame, to afford the government a pretext for interfering between them,—crushing both, sacrificing their lives, and enriching the governors with their lordly possessions; and when, thus goaded, they recurred to arms, in defence of themselves, their wives, their children, and their estates, they were pursued with the most ruthless and remorseless cruelty;[E] and, to palliate the tyranny, the rapine, and the barbarities of their oppressors, they were overwhelmed with the foulest abuse, and portraits drawn of them, which would have better suited incarnate demons than human beings.[F]

I have already hinted, that one of the principal objects of this work is to investigate the insurrection of 1641, strip it of the fraudulent misrepresentations by which it has been disfigured, and lay it before the world in the garb of truth.

In order, therefore, to induce the reader to bring to the subject a large portion of candour,—to evince on how "sandy a foundation" this story rests,—to expose the blind credulity, or the sinister policy, of the great body of historians, who have given full faith and confidence to the narrative of Sir John Temple, I shall submit a fair specimen of the documents on which his history depends for support. Fortunately for the holy cause of truth, but unfortunately for his character and his history, he has quoted his authorities at

full length. They are taken from the "*thirty-two thick folio volumes* of depositions" mentioned by Warner,[8] which exhibit such a mass of fraud, falsehood, absurdity, and let me add impossibility, as I may venture to assert never was exhibited before,—and, for the honour of human nature, it is to be hoped, never will be again. These depositions demand a much more detailed exposition than I can give them in the present chapter. It is a melancholy truth, that they form the basis of all the horrible narratives on this subject, of all the authors who have treated on it, from Temple to Clarendon, from Clarendon to Borlase, from Borlase to Hume, and from Hume down to Russell's Modern Europe. Temple embellished them with all the hideous colouring that could excite terror and abhorrence: and, I repeat, nearly all the succeeding historians have laid Temple under heavy contributions, and, without adverting to the fabulous evidence on which he relies, and which carries its own condemnation with it, have borrowed not merely his facts, but his very phraseology. The overwhelming decision of Dr. Warner, which I have quoted in page 20, ought to have set the question at rest, above fifty years ago.

I shall therefore devote several chapters to this particular subject, and give such copious extracts from the depositions, as will convince any

[8] Warner, 146.

man whose heart is not steeled, and whose conscience is not seared, against doing justice to the Irish, of the superlative wickedness of the tribunals which received such depositions, the equally superlative folly of the writer who filled his book with them, and the never-to-be-forgiven carelessness (to use the most favourable terms) of those writers who relied on such a deceptious, fraudulent guide.

To relieve the sombre hue of this long chapter, I shall give anticipatory extracts from a few of those wonderful tales, from which, as I have said, Temple and his copyists have drawn their highly-coloured pictures of the massacre.

"Arthur Culm, of Cloughwater, in the county of Cavan, esquire, deposeth, That *he was credibly informed*, by some that were present there, that there were thirty women and young children, and seven men, flung into the river of Belturbert; and when some of them offered to swim for their lives, they were, by the rebels, followed in boats, and knocked on the head with poles; the same day they hanged two women at Turbert; and *this deponent doth verily believe*, that Mulmore O'Rely, the then sheriff, had a hand in the commanding the murder of those said persons, *for that he saw him write two notes*, which he sent to Turbert, by Brien O'Rely, upon whose coming these murders were committed: and those persons who were present, also affirmed, that the bodies of *those thirty persons drowned did not appear upon the water till about six weeks after*, *past; as the said O'Rely came to the town*, *all the bodies came floating up to the very bridge;* those persons were all formerly stayed in the town by his protection, when the rest of their neighbours in the town went away."[9]

[9] Temple, 122.

It may not be time misemployed to examine this deposition, which, I beg leave to say, is less exceptionable than many others of this precious collection. The deponent was, in the first place, "*credibly informed*," that these persons "*were flung into the river*," and this information he had from "*some who were present there.*" He "*verily believed* that Mulmore O'Rely had a hand in commanding the murder:" and his "*belief*" rested on the very cogent and convincing reason, that he "*saw him write two notes*, which he sent to Turbert by Brien O'Rely, on whose coming these murders were committed." On this strong evidence, Mulmore O'Rely, in all likelihood, lost his life and estate, which estate was probably guilty of the murder. In Ireland, in former times, under the mild government of England, large estates were frequently guilty of enormous crimes, particularly high treason, and deservedly punished: and the larger they were, the more prone to guilt, and the more certain of punishment.

But on casting my eye once more over the deposition, I find I overlooked the chief part of the evidence against Mulmore. The "*thirty* bodies" (*seven* remained behind) rose up by common consent, when this murderer made his appearance, and "*came floating up to the very bridge*," probably as public prosecutors of this horrid culprit. It is not said, unfortunately, whether they took their oaths to the murder: this is.

however, presumable; and it is to be supposed that it was owing to an oversight, that Temple was silent on the subject. A doubt has been started by a learned barrister, whether the appearance of these bodies, "floating up to the very bridge," at the critical minute, when the said O'Rely "came to town," is to be considered as *positive* or *circumstantial* evidence. Much of this would depend on the property of Mulmore. If he were a very rich man, the appearance of "*thirty* bodies floating to the *very* bridge" ought to be regarded as *positive* evidence; but if a poor man, not worth hanging, it ought to be set down as circumstantial.

But to be serious:

Lives there a man who can peruse this deposition, find it introduced into a grave history, know it to have been a part of the evidence on which rests the credit of the tales of what Borlase's title-page states as "*the execrable Irish Rebellion*," and to have been, with other evidence, equally absurd, instrumental in confiscating the property and immolating the lives of the Irish Catholics; without a strong sentiment of mingled astonishment and indignation, without a thorough conviction, that all the histories, grounded on such documents, however supported by the imposing names of Clarendon, Hume, or Russell, must be radically false and corrupt, and worthy to be altogether rejected?

Another deposition, with equal gravity, narrates a story of a man who was wounded in several places, his belly ripped up, and his entrails taken out, without bleeding!!

"James Geare, of the county of Monaghan, deposeth, That the rebels at Clownes murdered one James Netterville, proctor to the minister there, who, *although he was diversely wounded, his belly ripped up, and his entrails taken out, and laid above a yard from him, yet he bled not at all*, until they lifted him up, and carried him away; at which this deponent being an eye-witness, much wondered; and thus barbarously they used him, after they had drawn him to go to mass with them."[10]

Another states, that one of the rebels made three attempts to stab a woman with a drawn sword; but such was her trust in God, and such his miraculous protection extended to her on the moment, that she was absolutely invulnerable.

"Mr. George Creighton, minister of Virginia, in the county of Cavan, deposeth, among other particulars in his examination, That divers women brought into his house a young woman, almost naked, to whom a rogue came up on the way, these women being present, and required her to give him her money, or else he would kill her, and so *drew his sword;* her answer was, "You cannot kill me unless God give you leave, and his will be done:" *whereupon the rogue thrust three times at her naked body, with his drawn sword, and yet never pierced her skin;* whereat he being, as it seems, much confounded, went away and left her; and that he saw this woman, and *heard this particular related by divers women*, who were by, and saw what they reported."[11]

And this wonderful story, be it observed, is testified to by a reverend minister of God, who

[10] Temple, 88. [11] Idem, 123.

was admirably qualified to authenticate it, as "*he heard it related by divers women, who saw what they reported.*"

But the most extraordinary and extravagant circumstance is the appearance of the ghosts of murdered persons, which, according to those "*manifest forgeries,*" received as "*solid proofs,*"[12] stationed themselves in the middle of a river, breast-high, and remained there for three months, that is, from December 20th, 1641, till the following lent, seeking vengeance on the "bloody Papists," crying "*Revenge, Revenge, Revenge.*"

"Catharine, the relict of William Cooke, late of the county of Armagh, carpenter, sworn and examined, saith, That about the 20th of December, 1641, a great number of rebels, in that county, did most barbarously drown, at that time, one hundred and eighty Protestants, men, women and children, in the river, at the bridge of Portnedown; and that, *about nine days afterwards, she saw a vision or spirit, in the shape of a man,* as she apprehended, that appeared in that river, in the place of the drowning, *bolt upright, breast-high, with hands lifted up, and stood in that posture there, until the latter end of lent next following:* about which time, some of the English army marching in those parts, whereof her husband was one, *(as he and they confidently told this deponent)* saw that spirit or vision standing upright, and in the posture aforementioned; but after that time, the said spirit or vision vanished, and appeared no more, that she knoweth. And she heard, but saw not, that there were other visions and apparitions, and much shrieking and strange noise heard in that river, at times afterward. Jurat. February 24, 1643."[13]

"Elizabeth, the wife of captain Rice Price, of Armagh, deposeth and saith, That she, and other women, whose husbands were murdered, hearing of divers apparitions and vi-

[12] Leland, IV. 131.

[13] Temple, 121.

sions, which were seen near Portnedown bridge, since the drowning of her children, and the rest of the Protestants there, went unto the bridge aforesaid, *about twilight in the evening; then and there, upon a sudden, appeared unto them a vision or spirit, assuming the shape of a woman, waist-high, upright, in the water, often repeating the word, Revenge! Revenge! Revenge!* whereat this deponent, and the rest, being put into an amazement and affright, walked from the place. Jurat. January 29, 1642."[14]

"James Shaw, of Market-Hill, in the county of Armagh, innkeeper, deposeth, That many Irish rebels, *in the time of this deponent's restraint and staying among them, told him very often, and that it was a common report,* that all those that lived about the bridge of Portnedown, were so affrighted with the cries and noise made there, of some spirits or visions, for revenge, as that they durst not stay, but fled away thence, (so as they protested,) affrighted to Market-Hill, saying, they durst not stay nor return thither, for fear of those cries and spirits, but took grounds and made creates in or near the parish of Mullabrack. Jurat. Aug. 14, 1642."[15]

"Joan, the relict of Gabriel Constable, late of Drumard, in the county of Armagh, gentleman, deposeth and saith, *That she hath often heard the rebels,* Owen O'Farren, Patrick O'Conellan, and divers others of the rebels at Drumard, *earnestly say, protest, and tell each other,* that the blood of some of those that were knocked in the heads, and afterwards drowned, at Portnedown bridge, still remained on the bridge, and would not be washed away; and *that often there appeared visions or apparitions, sometimes of men, sometimes of women, breast-high above the water,* at or near Portnedown, which did *most extremely and fearfully screech and cry out for vengeance against the Irish that murdered their bodies there;* and that their cries and shrieks did so terrify the Irish thereabouts, that none durst stay nor live longer there, but fled and removed further into the country; and this was a common report amongst the rebels there, and that it passed for a truth amongst them, for any thing she could ever observe to the contrary. Jurat. January 1, 1643."[16]

[14] Temple, 122. [15] Idem, 121. [16] Ibidem.

Almost every circumstance narrated in Temple's history, is corroborated by one or more depositions. Most of them are fully as absurd and as perjured as the above. A very large proportion are hearsay: "A being credibly informed that B had murdered one hundred Protestants," &c. &c. In the devouring rage against the persons, and lust after the property, of the Catholics, every kind of evidence was acceptable, no matter how absurd, improbable, or impossible.

In the number of the witnesses, who testify to the pretended massacre, the most distinguished is a dean Maxwell, afterwards bishop of Kilmore, an abstract of whose deposition is to be found in the Appendix to Borlase's history. It is a sort of history of the insurrection, and occupies no less than twelve large folio pages, which contain so many extravagant and impossible tales, that no man could swear to it but a perjurer. How many pages the whole contained, whether twenty, or fifty, or one hundred, it is impossible for me to decide; it is "to be sought for in the archives of Dublin."[17] On the dean's authority rests the hacknied and Gulliverian assertion, that the precise number of one hundred and fifty-four thousand were massacred, in three months, in Ulster: and yet, wonderful to tell, there is in this very deposition, on the all-important topic of the "*hundred and fifty-four thousand* persons slaughtered."

[17] Borlase, App. 126.

a most palpable and overwhelming contradiction, which at once destroys its credibility. In one part of it, the dean swears that "it was *credibly told him*, that the persons slaughtered amounted to one hundred and fifty-four thousand, *whether in Ulster or the whole kingdom*, he durst not inquire."* Why he durst not inquire, is not stated; and it is impossible to assign any reason:—the story carries absurdity on its face: the one kind of information was as readily and as soon acquired as the other. In a subsequent page, he swears positively, that "*there were then above one hundred and fifty-four thousand wanting in the province of Ulster alone.*" This discordance, which would destroy the evidence, in any honourable court in Christendom, of a Washington, a Franklin, a Fayette, a Sheridan, a Brougham, or a Wyndham, was of no importance in the *era of perjury*, anno 1642, when the lives and fortunes of the Irish were at stake, and when princely fortunes were the reward of the perjurer and his employer.

* *Extracts from the Deposition of Robert Maxwell, since Bishop of Kilmore.*

"And further saith, that it was credibly told him, that the rebels, *least they should hereafter be charged with more murders than they had committed*, commanded their priests to bring in a true account of them; and that the persons so slaughtered, *whether in Ulster, or the whole kingdom, the deponent durst not inquire*, in March last, amounted unto one hundred fifty-four thousand."[18]

[18] Borlase, App. 132.

"He might add to these many thousands more: but the diary which he, the deponent, wrote among the rebels, being burned with his house, books, and all his papers, *he referreth himself to the number in gross*, which the rebels themselves have upon inquiry found out and acknowledged, which notwithstanding *will come short of all that have been murdered in Ireland, there being above one hundred fifty and four thousand now wanting* of the British within the very precinct of Ulster. And the deponent further saith, that it was common table-talk amongst the rebels, that *the ghosts of Mr. William Fullerton, Timothy Jephes, and the most of those who were thrown over Portnedown bridge, were daily and nightly seen to walk upon the river*, sometimes singing of psalms, sometimes *brandishing of naked swords*, and sometimes *screeching in the most hideous and fearful manner.* The deponent did not believe the same at first, and yet is doubtful whether to believe it or not; but saith that divers of the rebels assured him, that they themselves did dwell near to the said river, and being daily frighted with these apparitions (but especially with their horrible screeching) were in conclusion forced to remove further into the country. *Their own priests and friars could not deny the truth thereof;* but as oft as it was by deponent objected unto them, they said, that it was but *a cunning slight of the devil to hinder this great work of propagating the catholic religion, and killing of heretics;* or that it was wrought by witchcraft. The deponent himself lived within thirteen miles of the bridge, and never heard any man so much as doubt of the truth thereof; howsoever the deponent obligeth no man's faith, in regard he saw it not with his own eyes; otherwise *he had as much certainty as morally could be required of such a matter.*"[19]

ROBERT MAXWELL.

Deposed to August 22, 1642.

JOHN WATSON,
WILLIAM ALDRICK.

[19] Borlase, App. 136.

Could there be a more extravagant idea held out, than the reason assigned for keeping an account of the murders, lest the murderers should be charged with a greater number than they actually killed? Some reason was necessary: but he who could not invent a more plausible pretext was ill calculated for his trade of king's evidence. No man, whose grade of intellect ranks beyond that of an ideot, can give credit to such a ridiculous story. Yet on such authority most of the writers on Irish affairs, and among the rest, as we have seen, Milton himself, gave countenance to the precise number of one hundred and fifty-four thousand persons murdered in Ulster alone. On the trial of lord Macguire, the same legend, "*with variations*" in point of number, was sworn to by Sir Charles Coote.

*Sir Charles Coote's Testimony concerning the generality of the Rebellion.*

"Sir Phelim O'Neile and Roger Moore were the actors in the massacres; and by public directions of some in place, and of the titulary bishops, for sending *an exact account of what persons were murdered* throughout all Ulster, a fourth part of the kingdom of Ireland, to the parish priests of every parish. And *they sent in a particular account of it*, and the account was *one hundred and four thousand seven hundred in one province*, in the first three months of the rebellion."[20]

[20] Trial of Lord Macguire, 227.

## NOTE I. ON CHAPTER II.

[A] P. 35. *Bigotry.*] Thank Heaven, we live in an enlightened age, whose liberality on the subject of differences in religious opinions, renders it difficult to conceive the deplorable bigotry and rancorous spirit of intolerance, that prevailed in that dark and persecuting era. Each denomination of Christians regarded its own opinions as infallible, and all others as heretical and damnable: and, next to the right of worshipping God as they thought proper, they prized the right to control, restrain, and persecute all who dared to differ from them; and instances are to be found, of their exculpating themselves from the charge of being friendly to *toleration*, as from some foul crime. All abhorred it, as the greatest abomination. The solemn league and covenant, which was most tyrannically enforced on all classes, expressly avowed its object to be the EXTIRPATION of "Popery, *prelacy*, superstition, *heresy*, *schism*, and *whatsoever shall be found to be contrary to sound doctrine and the power of Godliness.*" Popery had originally an exclusive monopoly of the detestation of the Puritans; but when they had succeeded in suppressing it, the established religion, from its supposed affinity to Popery, became almost equally odious to them; and, whenever they had the power, was prohibited

under heavy penalties, not quite so severe, however, as those against Popery. "*Heresy, schism, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of Godliness*,"* embraced every religious opinion or practice, which in the slightest degree varied from the Westminster Confession of Faith.† This was the standard of perfection, by which the ruling powers measured

* "1647, November 23. Debate upon the ordinance against blasphemies and heresies, and *the punishment voted to be death*."[22]

1647, October 13. The Commons voted, that "The liberty of conscience granted shall extend to none that shall preach, print, or publish any thing *contrary to the first fifteen of the thirty-nine articles*, except the eighth."[23]

"1644, August 9. Ordered, That Mr. White do give order for the public burning of one Williams his books, intituled, &c. *concerning the tolerating of all sects of Christians*."[24]

"Concerning religion, *we have expressed the desires of the kingdom of Scotland, and given a testimony against toleration*."[25]

† "1643, Oct. 16. Ordered, That such members of the House, as have not yet taken the Solemn League and Covenant, do take and subscribe the same on Thursday next, which day is appointed *a peremptory day for the taking and subscribing the same by such members*."[26]

"1645, May 8. Order, That the company of merchant adventurers *do send the Covenant to all of their company, at home and abroad, and return the names of such as shall refuse to take it*."[27]

"1645–6, January 15. A petition from the lord mayor, aldermen, and common council of London, to the House of

[22] Whitelock, 232. [23] Idem, 276. [24] Journals, III. 585.
[25] Thurloe, I. 111. [26] Journals, III. 318 [27] Whitelock, 140.

the rectitude or depravity of faith or conduct. It was the true theological and intellectual bed of Procrustes, whereby redundancies of opinion were to be lopped off, and deficiencies to be supplied. He who could not command or feign assent to the most minute particulars of this confession, was branded as a "*delinquent*" no matter how orthodox he might be in general. The solemnization of Christmas, and various ceremonies, wholly indifferent in themselves, were interdicted, and made punishable. The use of the book of common prayer was likewise forbidden, under heavy penalties.*

Peers, *desiring the speedy settling of church government, according to the Covenant;* and

"That *no toleration be granted of Popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, or any thing contrary to sound doctrine*, and that all private meetings, contrary to the Covenant, may be restrained."[28]

* "1647, December 20. Referred to a committee, to examine *what delinquent ministers did preach, or read the book of common prayer, and to silence them.*"[29]

"1646, March 1. Both Houses gave an allowance to the earl of Chesterfield, with an intimation that he do not entertain malignant preachers in his house, *nor use the book of common prayer.*"[30]

"1647, October 16. Debate touching religion, and voted, That the indulgence as to tender consciences *shall not extend to tolerate the common prayer.*"[31]

"*This indulgence shall not extend to tolerate the use of the book of common prayer, in any place whatsoever.*"[32]

[28] Parl. Hist. XII. 194. [29] Whitelock, 285.
[30] Idem, 243. [31] Idem, 276. [32] Thurloe, I. 47.

When their reformed brethren experienced such "*tender mercies*" at their hands, it is easy to conceive what mercy and justice were meted out to the Roman Catholics, who were the objects of their inveterate and universal abhorrence. In this one point, all the reformers, however envenomed and hostile towards each other, most perfectly accorded.

When this horrible and anti-christian spirit assumed the efficient shape of statutes, it tortured itself into the production of a system of the most revolting injustice. A slight sketch of it would fill volumes. It would extend beyond the limits prescribed to this chapter, to enter into detail. I shall therefore confine myself, for the present, to two of its features, by which some idea may be formed of its true character. These were framed under Protestant Episcopal monarchs.

A Roman Catholic was liable to a penalty of twenty pounds a month, (and observe, there were thirteen months in the legal year) if he did not attend public worship, in one of the established churches, on Sundays. This extravagant and ruinous penalty, which was imposed under Elizabeth, was not deemed enough to satisfy the rapacity of the ruling party under James I.; and accordingly an act was passed, in the third year of his reign, authorizing the king to seize two-thirds of the estates of the Roman Catholics, in lieu of the penalty.[33]

[33] Pickering, VII. 154.

But wicked as was this law, there was one that far exceeded it. A penalty of ten pounds a month was imposed on those who "*relieved or harboured*" persons who did not attend worship in some established church: and to this penalty every man or woman was liable, even for "*maintaining, retaining, relieving, keeping, or harbouring his or her father or mother,*" if that father or mother were within the purview of the statute. But, as "a special grace and favour," there was a clause, exempting from the penalty those whose parents were paupers, or destitute of "sufficient maintenance."

"Provided nevertheless, That this act shall not in any wise extend to punish, or impeach, any person or persons, FOR MAINTAINING, RETAINING, RELIEVING, KEEPING, OR HARBOURING HIS, HER, OR THEIR FATHER OR MOTHER! *wanting, without fraud or covin, other habitation, or sufficient maintenance*, or the ward of any such person, or any person that shall be committed by authority to the custody of any by whom they shall be so relieved, maintained, or kept; any thing in this act contained to the contrary notwithstanding."[34]

This provision, however, ought not to be supposed to arise from liberality or justice, but from a sordid fear, lest the poor parents should become burdensome to the parish.

* Four pages, containing a great variety of proofs of the positions advanced in the text, have been cancelled in this place; the citations being deemed redundant.

[34] Pickering, VII. 161.

Who

Who can reflect on this law, without a holy abhorrence of the spirit by which it was dictated, and the men by whom it was enacted? The decalogue and the laws and customs of all the savage as well as civilized world, with the single exception, at that period, of England, order us to honour our fathers and mothers: but in that wretched and besotted age, a man was liable to pay one hundred and thirty pounds sterling per annum, for even "*relieving or harbouring* his father or mother," if they were so conscientiously scrupulous as not to abandon the religion in which they were educated, and conform to a religion they abhorred.

He might harbour or relieve a drunkard, an adulterer, a thief, a robber, or even a murderer, without penalty: but the "*relieving*" the mother who bore him, might involve him in ruin!!

The foregoing extracts, although principally taken from English laws and proceedings, are perfectly in point here, as the same spirit of bigotry and remorseless persecution inspired the leaders of the predominant party in both kingdoms; and, as naturally might be expected, produced similar fruits on both sides of the Irish channel.

## NOTE II. ON CHAPTER II.

[B] P. 35. *Ravenous thirst for the blood of the natives.*] However shocking and incredible it may appear, it is established, by the concurring testimony of Clarendon, Carte, Warner, Leland, and nearly all the other writers on that period of Irish history, that the predominant party in Ireland cherished, for a considerable time, the bloodthirsty and barbarous project of an utter extirpation of the Catholics, and the establishment of new plantations all over the kingdom. To the attainment of this nefarious object, all their measures were invariably directed: nor did they abandon it from its inhumanity, but from finding it utterly impracticable.

"The favourite object of the Irish governors, and the English parliament, was the *utter extermination of all the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland!* Their estates were already marked out, and allotted to their conquerors; so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin."[51]

"It is evident from their [the lords justices] last letter to the lieutenant, that they hoped for *an extirpation, not of the mere Irish only, but of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics*."[52]

"Whatever were the professions of the chief governors, *the only danger they really apprehended, was that of a too speedy suppression of the rebels.* The futility of their pretences and affected fears was instantly discovered."[53]

"The justices seem to have taken proper measures to exasperate the natives against the English transplanted thither, as if they were so secure of baffling the rebels when they pleased, that they wished that they might go on unchecked for a while,

[51] Leland, III. 192. [52] Warner, 176. [53] Leland, III. 185.

*that the forfeited lands might be the more*, and the nation attain to peace only by the vastness of the desolation; and of all this, their own management, give too many and too observable intimations."[54]

"Parsons and Borlase did, by their authority, command many things, which did *not only exasperate*, *but render the Irish desperate*, as will appear by several of their own letters, and public acts of state; and that, in the first eruption of the rebellion, *they had a greater eye to the forfeitures of the rebels' estates*, than to use such means as might, by the hopes of pardon, induce the better sort of the nobility, gentry, and freeholders to hear reason, and to come in and submit themselves to his majesty's mercy, though they had express directions from the king and the two houses so to do: and it is no less notorious, that Sir John Temple, in writing his history, was bound by confederacy to assert the proceedings of the then lords justices."[55]

"The parliament party, who had heaped so many reproaches and calumnies upon the king, for his clemency to the Irish, who had grounded their own authority and strength upon such foundations as were inconsistent with any toleration of the Roman Catholic religion, and even *with any humanity to the Irish nation*, and more especially to those of the old native extraction, *the whole race whereof they had upon the matter sworn to extirpate*."[56]

"To say nothing of what was done by that Parliament, relating to affairs here which had an affinity to those of Ireland, the House of Commons passed a vote, *that no toleration of the Romish religion should be allowed in Ireland;* and that the House of Lords should be desired to join with them, in addressing the king to make a public declaration to that effect. This might serve their own ends perhaps, but was surely very unseasonable with regard to Ireland, where nothing could so much promote the cause of the rebellion, as to have it thought a mere war of religion: this violence of the Parliament gave *too much credit to the reports that were continually flying about*, *of a design of* EXTIRPATING *the Roman Catholics*.[57]

[54] Clarendon's I. Preface. [55] Nalson, II. 7.
[56] Clarendon's I. 115. [57] Warner, 133.

"If it be more needful to dispose of places out of hand, and that it may stand with his majesty's pleasure to fill some of them with Irish that are Protestants, and *that have not been for the extirpation of the Papist natives*, it will much satisfy both, and cannot justly be excepted against."[58]

"Mr. Brent landed lately here, and hath brought with him such letters as have somewhat changed the face of this government from what it was, when the Parliament pamphlets were received as oracles, their commands obeyed as laws, and *extirpation preached for Gospel*."[59]

"Though *extirpation both of nation and religion* be not named, yet I conceive *it is contrived almost in every proposition;* and the consideration thereof confirms me in a full belief of the malicious practices of the Cootes and Ormsbyes, in the county of Roscommon."[60]

"*The term of extirpation is worn out here*, and the intention not acknowledged to me by the prime authors therein, with whom I have been plain after my blunt way."[61]

"The reason of their [the justices] advice is founded upon *their darling scheme of an extirpation of the old English proprietors, and a general plantation of the whole kingdom with a new colony;* for this is the meaning of what they allege, to show it to be "unsafe for his majesty, and destructive to the kingdom, to grant the petitioners' request; as being altogether inconsistent with *the means of raising a considerable revenue for his crown, of settling religion and civility in the kingdom;* and of establishing a firm and lasting peace, to the honour of his majesty, the safety of his royal posterity, and the comfort of all his faithful subjects."[62]

"By precipitate votes, the two Houses, confiscating all their lands, and making sale of them, *cast the whole nation into such a general despair*, that if there were any loyal or innocent among them, (which, we may justly fear, were very few) they were *forced to take party with those, whom very probably they might abhor*."[63]

[58] Carte, III. 226. [59] Idem, 169. [60] Idem, 311.
[61] Idem, 155. [62] Carte, I. 391. [63] Warwick, 200.

These difficulties and considerations were of little weight with the lords justices; who, having got a thin House of Commons to their mind, of persons devoted to their interest and measures, resolved to improve the opportunity offered, and to get such acts passed, as might distress the king, *exasperate the bulk of the nation, spread the rebellion, and so promote their darling scheme of extinguishing the old proprietors, and making a new plantation of the kingdom.*"[64]

"Such considerations as these were not agreeable to the views of the lords justices, *who had set their hearts on the extirpation, not merely of the mere Irish, but likewise of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics*, and the making of a new plantation all over the kingdom; in which they could not fail to have a principal share; so all their reasonings, upon all occasions, were calculated and intended to promote that their favourite scheme.

"This scheme would have been destroyed, if the rebels in general had submitted, upon the late proclamation; there was a general disposition in those of the Pale, and offers made by the chiefs of them to submit: and nothing was so likely to stop the effects of that disposition, as to treat those, who had actually submitted, in such a manner as to show the rest, that they should receive no favours upon such submission, nor any benefit by his majesty's proclamation. Hence *all the gentlemen, who surrendered themselves, were, without being admitted to the presence of the justices, committed to the castle of Dublin;* preparations were made for their trial, and designs published of their being prosecuted with the utmost severity. But as the prisoners had never appeared in the field, nor been concerned in any warlike action, there was a want of proper facts wherewith to charge them, and of sufficient witnesses to prove those facts. To supply both these defects, *the lords justices had recourse to the rack*, a detestable expedient, invented to extort from unhappy prisoners, in the anguish of their pain, or in the terror of the tortures prepared for them, such confessions as those who have the management of that accursed instrument, have a mind to put into their mouths; and therefore

[64] Carte, I. 330.

justly abhorred by all lovers of liberty, and forbidden by the laws of England."[65]

"These measures *served their own scheme of an extirpation*, by racking those gentlemen, whose treatment could not fail of deterring every body from venturing themselves into their power for the future."[66]

"These propositions, for putting the Roman Catholics of Ireland under greater hardships than any they had ever complained of before, incapacitating them from all offices whatever, disabling them from sitting in Parliament, (a privilege which they had always enjoyed, and from which alone they could expect any redress of future grievances) forfeiting all their estates, real and personal, and yet obliging them, when their all was taken from them, to make impossible reparations and satisfactions for losses sustained, and devastations committed, in the war; suppressing their religion, banishing all their clergy, and *new planting the kingdom*, were evidently calculated to hinder any peace at all; and certainly came from some of *that party of men which first formed the design of an extirpation of the Roman Catholics, and, by publishing that design, made the rebellion so general as it proved at last.* They all breathed the same spirit; and *though extirpation both of nation and religion was not expressly mentioned*, yet it seemed to be contrived effectually in all the propositions. They appeared so monstrous and unreasonable, that it was thought they could proceed from nothing but an high degree of madness or malice."[67]

"There is too much reason to think, that, as the lords justices really wished the rebellion to spread, and more gentlemen of estates to be involved in it, that *the forfeitures might be the greater, and a general plantation be carried on by a new set of English Protestants all over the kingdom, to the ruin and expulsion of all the old English and natives that were Roman Catholics;* so, to promote what they wished, they gave out speeches upon occasions, insinuating such a design, and that *in a short time there would not be a Roman Catholic left in the whole kingdom.* It is no small confirmation of this notion,

[65] Carte, I. 293. [66] Idem, 301. [67] Idem, 502.

that the earl of Ormond, in his letters of January 27th, and February 25th, 1641–2, to Sir W. St. Leger, imputes the general revolt of the nation, then far advanced, to the publishing of such a design; and when a person of his great modesty and temper, the most averse in his nature to speak his sentiments of what he could not but condemn in others, and who, when obliged to do so, does it always in the gentlest expression, is drawn to express such an opinion, the case must be very notorious. I do not find that the copies of these letters are preserved: but the original of Sir W. St. Leger's, in answer to them, sufficiently shows it to be his lordship's opinion; for, after acknowledging the receipt of these two letters, he useth these words, *The undue promulgation of that severe determination, to extirpate the Irish and Papacy out of this kingdom, your lordship rightly apprehends to be too unseasonably published.*"[68]

## NOTE III. ON CHAPTER II.

[c] P. 35. *Thirst for the estates.*] Identified with the sanguinary project of "exterminating" the devoted Roman Catholics, the existence of which is fully proved in the preceding note, was that of confiscating the whole of their estates, for the aggrandizement of their sworn enemies. The evidences adduced in support of the exterminating scheme, might suffice to establish that of confiscation. But I wish to "*make assurance doubly sure*," and shall therefore submit a document, which cannot fail to satisfy the reader, that I have not over-rated the extravagant and rapacious thirst that prevailed with the predominant party in England and Ireland, for the possessions of the Irish Catholics. The insurrection began

[68] Carte, I. 263.

in Ulster, on the 23d of October, 1641, and did not spread into the other provinces for several weeks: nor was it in any degree general, till *late in December*. Even at that period, there were very large portions of the country, particularly in Connaught and Munster, which were wholly free from rebellion, notwithstanding the efforts of the lords justices to goad them into it. Yet so early as the 16th of February, 1642, (that is, about two months afterwards) a company of adventurers was formed in London, who calculated on *the forfeiture of the whole island, except what belonged to the Protestants.* This extravagant project is fortunately recorded, at full length, in the Journals of the English House of Commons. These adventurers presented an address to Parliament, stating, that when "the work of reducing the kingdom of Ireland" was "finished," there would be "*of confiscated lands*, such as go under the name of *profitable lands*," no less than "TEN MILLIONS OF ACRES!!"

According to Sir William Petty's calculation, there were but two-thirds of the surface of Ireland, which were called "*profitable lands;*" the remaining third consisting of "highways, loughs, impassable bogs, rocks, shrubs, and coarse land."[69] As the whole contents of Ireland are only about nineteen millions of acres, it is clear, that nothing short of a general extirpation of the natives, and as general a confiscation of

[69] Petty, 1.

their estates, was contemplated; for, deducting the "unprofitable lands," and the possessions of the Protestants, there would not remain above ten millions of acres.* This measure was adopted

February 1, 1641–2.

* *Proposition made by divers gentlemen, citizens, and others, for the speedy and effectual reducing of the kingdom of Ireland.*

1st. They do compute, that less than a million of money will not perfect that work.

2nd. They do conceive, that the work being finished, there will be in that kingdom, of confiscated lands, such as go under the name of profitable lands, *ten millions of acres*, English measure.

3d. That two millions and a half of those acres, to be equally taken out of the four provinces, will sufficiently satisfy those that shall advance this million of money.

4th. That the two millions and a half of acres may be divided amongst them after this proportion, viz.

For each adventure of 200*l.* a thousand acres in Ulster.
300*l.* a thousand acres in Connaught.
450*l.* a thousand acres in Munster.
600*l.* a thousand acres in Leinster.
All English measure,

Consisting of meadow, arable and profitable pasture; *the bogs, woods, and barren mountains, being cast in, over and above.*

These two millions and a half of acres to be holden in free and common socage of the king, as of his castle of Dublin.

5th. That out of these two millions and a half of acres, a constant rent shall be reserved to the crown of England, after this proportion, viz.

Out of each acre thereof in

| | |
|---|---|
| Ulster, - - - - | 1 *d.* |
| Connaught, - - - | 1 *ob.* |
| Munster, - - - - | 2 *qrs.* |
| Leinster, - - - - | 3 *d.* |

Whereby his majesty's revenue, out of those lands, will be

from principles of Machiavelian policy, to drive the Catholics to desperation, by shutting the door against all hopes of retreat. Tyrants and conquerors, leading devastating armies in their train, have often grasped at *millions of acres:* but, throughout the wide range of the history of private spoil, there is no parallel case, except, perhaps, in Hindostan, during the last hundred years. Ten millions of acres to be forfeited! What an appalling idea this inspires of the deplorable state of the victims, and the inhumanity of those who offered them up as holocausts on the altars of rapine and bigotry!

The English Parliament readily acquiesced in the proposal; and immediately passed an act,* for the purpose of carrying it into effect. But, as they probably felt ashamed to recognize the extravagant grasp at "ten millions of acres," they

much improved, besides the advantage that he will have, by the coming to his hands of all other the lands of the rebels and their personal estates, without any charge to his majesty.[70]

* "Whereas, divers worthy and well affected persons, perceiving that many millions of acres of the rebels' lands of that kingdom, which go under the name of profitable lands, will be confiscate and to be disposed of, and that in that case two millions and a half of those acres, to be equally taken out of the four provinces of that kingdom, may be allotted for the satisfaction of such persons as shall disburse any sums of money, for the reducing of the rebels there, which would effectually accomplish the same, have made these propositions ensuing," &c. &c. as before.[71]

[70] Journals, II. 435. [71] May, 307.

made a slight variation in the phraseology, and substituted "*many millions*."

## NOTE IV. ON CHAPTER II.

[D] P. 35. *The Courcys, the Fitzstephenses, the Fitzgeralds.*] Many of the descendants of the early English settlers, being possessed of exorbitant wealth and immense territories, held out to the needy and rapacious deputies, who were sent to rule Ireland, stronger temptations to plunder than the aboriginals; and hence they frequently experienced more dire oppression and cruelty than the latter.

One very simple and very common mode of driving these great lords into what was called rebellion, but what was merely affording the deputies a pretence for making war, and committing depredations on them, was to summon them, in an arbitrary manner, to appear before those rulers, or in parliament, where they had every prospect of being seized, and, under false pretences, thrown into prison, perhaps hanged or beheaded by martial law:* or, if they were deterred from appearing, they were proclaimed as contumacious traitors, and "the dogs of war" let loose on them. There are numberless cases of

* "Richard Bourke, called the Usule of Ireland, was at Castell ne Kelly hanged by martial law, information being there given, that he was confederate with the rebels, and under pretext of dutiful obedience, and visitation of the governor, *intended to betray him and his company!*"[72]

[72] Perrot, 95.

this kind on record, of which, when I resume the subject, in a subsequent part of this work, I shall give some of the most striking. I confine myself, for the present, to a few, of which the chief is that of the earl of Desmond, whose large estates held out temptations to the rapacity of Ralph De Ufford, lord justice, who administered the government, under Edward III.

To this earl a summons was sent to attend parliament, with which he declined compliance. On this sole, this miserable pretext, the lord justice immediately raised an army,* and, meeting with no resistance, seized all his vast possessions,

* "This Uffort, lord justice, *on pain of forfeiture of all his lands*, commanded the earl of Desmond to make his personal appearance at a parliament which he called to be holden at Dublin, there to begin the seventh of June; and, because the earl refused to come, according to the summons, *he raised the king's standard, and, with an army, marched into Munster, and there seized the earl's possessions into the king's hands, letting them forth to farm, for an annual rent, unto other persons.* And, whilst he yet remained in Munster, he devised ways how to have the earl of Desmond apprehended; which being brought to pass, he afterwards delivered him upon mainprise of these sureties, whose names ensue: William De Burgh, earl of Ulster; James Butler, earl of Ormond; Richard Tute, Nicholas Verdon, Morice Rochford, Eustace Le Powre, Gerald De Rochford, John Fitzrobert Powre, Robert Barrie, Maurice Fitzgerald, John Wellesly, Walter Le Fant, Richard Rokelly, Henry Traherne, Roger Powre, John Lenfant, Roger Powre, Matthew Fitzhenrie, Richard Wallers, Edmond Burgh, son to the earl of Ulster, knights; David Barrie, William Fitzgerald, Foulke De Fraxinus, Robert Fitzmaurice, Henry Fitzberklie, John Fitzgeorge De Roch, Thomas De Lees De Burgh; these (as ye have heard) were bound for the earl.

and slaughtered his principal followers. He soon found means to seize the earl himself, and bound no less than twenty-seven of the nobility and gentry as sureties for his good behaviour. He afterwards summoned the earl before him, who, "finding his severity, thought it dangerous to appear, according to the condition of the recognizance, and therefore it was escheated into the exchequer."[73] Ufford rapaciously availed himself of this opportunity, and seized the estates of twenty-three of "*the mainpernors*," according to Hooker, or of eighteen, according to Cox.*

Besides these acts of oppression, "he caused the earl of Kildare to be arrested, and committed to the castle of Dublin;"[74] indicted and imprisoned many others; annulled a number of charters; and "proceeded every way *so roundly and severely*, as the nobility, which were wont to suffer no controulment, did much distaste him."[75] This case affords a proof how little dependence can be placed on the accounts given of Irish affairs by English writers: for, of this odious oppressor, who was a mere Verres, and, according to

And because he made default, *the lord justice verily took the advantage of the mainpernors*, four of them only excepted, the two earls and two knights."[76]

* "Though the noblemen, and some of the knights, made a shift to get rid of this matter, yet eighteen of the knights lost their estates, and *were utterly ruined thereby*."[77]

[73] Cox, 121. [74] Davies, 153. [75] Ibid.
[76] Hollinshed, VI. 255. [77] Cox, 121.

Hollinshed, "*was very rigorous*, and, through persuasion (as was said) of his wife, *more extreme and covetous* than he otherwise would have been,"[78] Sir John Davies says, "*in troth, he was a singular good justicer.*"[79] Hollinshed does not pretend to deny his severity and rigour, but charges it wholly to the account of his wife, who was "bent to prick him forward unto *sharp dealings, and rigorous proceedings.*"[80] And further, "His lady, it would appear, was verily but a miserable woman, procuring him to EXTORTION AND BRIBERY."[81] A very novel and extraordinary trait, truly, in the character of "a good justicer!"

The case of another earl of Desmond, two hundred and fifty years later, is still more lamentable. Henry Sydney, the lord deputy, thirsting after his immense possessions, and desirous of driving him into rebellion, seized him, under the most flimsy pretexts, and carried him in duress, in an extensive circuit he made through the country. The earl finally effected an escape; and was peremptorily cited to appear before the earl, and to surrender his strongest fortresses. The ignominious treatment he had experienced, and the imminent danger he had escaped, deterred him from confiding his person into the deputy's hands. He was accordingly proclaimed a traitor, and his territories laid waste, with the

[78] Hollinshed, VI. 255. [79] Davies, 154.
[80] Hollinshed, VI. 255. [81] Idem, 256.

most Vandalic rage, as shall be stated in the next note.

The injustice with which he was treated, will appear palpable, from two of the items of the proclamation, by one of which he was charged with seeking for foreign and domestic aid;* and, by another, at the same time, with destroying his castles, and burning his towns,† "to the intent her majesty's forces and subjects should not be succoured nor refreshed."

It is difficult to decide whether the wickedness or absurdity of these accusations is the greater. If he intended to enter into rebellion, it would have been the quintessence of madness to destroy his castles. The one effectually destroys the other.

It does not fall within my present view, to enter into detail on the progress of this war. Suffice it to say, that the earl was reduced to a most deplorable state of wretchedness; finally assassinated in a filthy cabin; and his estate, which consisted of five hundred and seventy-four

* "That he daily looketh for a further aid, and a new supply of foreigners, and daily soliciteth the chief men of the Irish counties to join with him in this, his most execrable and rebellious enterprize."[82]

† "That he hath not only refused to deliver up doctor Sanders and the Spaniards, which do daily accompany him; but hath broken down his castles, burned his towns, and desolated his countries aforehand, to the intent her majesty's forces and subjects shall not be succoured nor refreshed."[83]

[82] Hooker, apud Hollinshed, 424. [83] Ibid.

thousand six hundred and twenty-eight acres, partly seized by government, and partly parcelled out among the British officers,* who had been instrumental in goading him into resistance. When such were the temptations to civil war, and such the rewards for the desolation perpe-

* "The earl of Desmond and his accomplices had forfeited a vast estate, amounting in all to 574,628 acres of land. The earl himself had a prodigious revenue, for these times; and perhaps greater than any other subject in her majesty's dominions."[84]

Of this immense estate, portions were bestowed on the following undertakers:

| | | Acres. |
|---|---|---|
| Co. Waterford, | Sir Christopher Hutton | 10,910 |
| Co. Cork and Waterford, | Sir W. Raleigh | 12,000 |
| Co. Kerry, | Sir Edward Denny | 6,000 |
| Ib. | Sir William Harbart | 13,276 |
| Ib. | Charles Harbart | 3,768 |
| Ib. | John Holly | 4,422 |
| Ib. | Capt. Jenkin Conway | 526 |
| Ib. | John Champion | 1,434 |
| Cork, | Sir Warham Saint Lesser | 6,000 |
| Ib. | Hugh Caff | 6,000 |
| Ib. | Sir Thomas Norris | 6,000 |
| Ib. | Arthur Robins | 1,800 |
| Ib. | Arthur Hide, | 5,574 |
| Ib. | Francis Butcher and Hugh Wirth | 24,000 |
| Ib. | Thomas Say | 3,778 |
| Ib. | Arthur Hyde, | 11,766 |
| Ib. | Edmund Spencer | 3,028 |
| Cork and Waterford, | Richard Beacon | 6,000 |
| Limerick, | Sir William Courtney | 10,500 |
| Ib. | Francis Birkly, Esq. | 7,250 |
| Ib. | Robert Anslow | 2,599 |
| | | 206,631 |

[84] Cox, 392.

trated, it cannot surprise us, that Ireland was a constant theatre of rapine, conflagration, and devastation.

Sometimes the parents of the ill-fated victims, thus hunted down, were seized, and thrown into dungeons, as accomplices of the crimes, real or pretended, of their children. The case of Sir Walter De La Hide and his lady is a striking one. They were, on account of the rebellion of their son, imprisoned and cruelly treated. The lady was basely tampered with, and threatened with the rack,* in order to induce her to accuse her hus-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 206,631 |
| Limerick, | Richard and Alex. Fitton - - | 3,026 |
| Ib. | Edmund Manwaring, Esq. - - | 3,747 |
| Ib. | Waterford, Inverary, Sir Edward Fitton | 11,515 |
| Ib. | Wm. Trenchard, Esq. - - - | 12,000 |
| Ib. | George Thornton, Esq. - - - | 1,500 |
| Ib. | Sir George Bourcher, - - - | 12,880 |
| Ib. | Henry Billingsley, Esq. - - - | 11,800 |
| Inverary, | Thomas, Earl of Ormond - - - | 3,000 |
| | | 259,499[85] |

* "Sir Walter De La Hide, knight, and his wife, the lady Gennet Eustace, were apprehended, and brought as prisoners, by master Brabson, vice-treasurer, from their town of Moiclare, to the castle of Dublin, *because their son and heir, James De La Hide, was the only brewer of all this rebellion;* who, as the governor suspected, was set on by his mother. The knight and his wife, lying in duress for the space of twelve months, were at several times examined, and notwithstanding all presumptions and surmises that could be gathered, *they were in the end found guiltless of their son his folly.* But the lady

[85] Cox, 393.

band! and finally, worn down with savage treatment, she died in prison, of a broken heart. But the rage and malice of her persecutor followed her even after death. He, for a time, denied her corpse interment, declaring, that the carcase of the mother of such a traitor ought rather to be thrown out on a dung-hill, for ravens and dogs. than to have Christian burial.

## NOTE V. ON CHAPTER II.

[E] P. 36. *Remorseless cruelty.*] The barbarity with which the English deputies pursued the natives, the depredations they perpetrated, and the havoc they made of the human species, will stand a fair comparison with the desolation per-

was had in examination apart, and *enticed by means to charge her husband with her son his rebellion*, who, being not won thereto, with all the means that could be wrought, *was menaced to be put to death, or* TO BE RACK'T, and so with extremity to be compelled, whereas with gentleness she could not be allured to acknowledge these apparent treasons, that neither her husband nor she could, without great show of impudence, deny.

"The gentlewoman, *with these continual storms heart-broken, deceased in the castle:* from thence her body was removed unto the gray friars, with the deputy his commandment, that *it should not be interred, until his pleasure were further known;* adding withal, that *the carcase of one who was the mother of so arrant an arch-traitor, ought rather to be cast out on a dunghill, to be carrion for ravens and dogs to gnaw upon, than to be laid in any Christian grave.* The corpse lying four or five days in this plight, at the request of the lady Gennet Golding, wife to Sir John White, the governor licensed that it should be buried."[86]

[86] Hooker, apud Hollinshed, VI. 302.

petrated by any of the destroyers of mankind, in any age or nation. The conflagration of all the towns and villages, as far as their power extended, the waste of every thing that could minister to the sustenance of human life,* and the indis-

* "The next daie following being the twelfe of March, the lord justice and the earle divided their armie into two several companies by two ensigns and three together, the lord justice taking the one side, and the other taking the other side of Slewlougher, and *so they searched the woods, burned the towne, and killed that daie about foure hundred men, and returned the same night with all the cattell which they found that day.*

"And the said lords, being *not satisfied with this daie's service*, they did likewise the next daie divide themselves, *spoiled and consumed the whole countrie until it was night.*"[87]

"They passed over the same into Conilo, where the lord justice and the earl of Ormond divided their companies, and as they marched, *they burned and destroyed the country;* and they both that night encamped within one mile at Kilcolman."[88]

"Great were the services which these garrisons performed: for Sir Richard Pierce and captain George Flower, with their troopes, *left neither corn nor horne, nor house unburnt, between Kinsale and Ross.* Captain Roger Harvie, who had with him his brother, captain Gawen Harvie, captain Francis Slingsbie, captain William Stafford, with their companies of the Lord Barry and the treasurer, with the President's horse, *did the like between Ross and Bantry.*"[89]

"Immediately, and within an hour after this proclamation, the countess of Desmond came to the camp; but the camp was before dislodged from the town, and *all his country forthwith consumed with fire, and nothing was spared that fire and sword could consume.*"[90]

[87] Hollinshed, VI. 430. [88] Ibid.
[89] Pacata Hibernia, 645. [90] Hollinshed, VI. 424.

criminate slaughter of man, woman, and child,* are recorded by themselves, if not as acts of heroism and glory, at least as mere matters of course.

"Some were slain of the lord governor's men, though not so many, amongst whom captain Zouches trumpeter was one; which so grieved the lord general, that *he commanded all the houses, towns, and villages, in that country, and about Lefinnen*, which in any way did belong to the earl of Desmond, or of any of his friends and followers, *to be burned and spoiled.*"[91]

"Hereupon Sir Charles, with the English regiments, overran all Beare and Bantry, destroying *all that they could find meet for the relief of men, so as that country was wholly wasted.*"[92]

* "And as they went, they drove the whole country before them unto the ventrie, and by that means they preyed and took all the cattle in the country, to the number of eight thousand kine, besides horses, garrons, sheep, and goats, and *all such people as they met, they did without mercy put to the sword;* by these means, the whole country having no cattle nor kine left, they were driven to such extremities, that *for want of victuals they were either to die and perish for famine, or to die under the sword.*"[93]

"The soldiers, likewise, in the camp, were so hot upon the spur, and so eager upon the vile rebels, that that day *they spared neither man, woman, nor child, but all was committed to the sword.*"[94]

"The next morning being the fourth of January, 1602, Sir Charles coming to seek the enemy in their camp, he entered into their quarter without resistance, where *he found nothing but hurt and sick men, whose pains and lives by the soldiers were both determined.*"[95]

[91] Hollinshed, VI. 425.
[92] Pacata Hibernia, 659.
[93] Hollinshed, 427.
[94] Idem, 430.
[95] Pacata Hibernia, 659.

And, from the scenes recorded by Hooker, Spencer, and Cox, it may be said, without exaggeration, that Ireland, for a long period, was literally a great human slaughter-house, where the natives were hunted down and butchered like so many wild beasts, and where many of the rulers appeared under as hideous an aspect as was ever displayed in any country, or at any period. Should this declaration appear to the reader too highly coloured, he has only to read the annexed proofs, to remove all his doubts.

The wanton and wicked destruction of the fruits of the earth, expressly ordered and carried into effect to produce famine, was as fatal to the Irish, as the havoc made of the human species in the field of battle, or on the defenceless of both sexes and every age, throughout their caverns and hiding-places, where they were remorselessly pursued. It fulfilled the intentions of the victors, and created a most deplorable famine, whereby scenes of misery were produced, of which the examples are rare.* The natives were driven,

"Captain Francis Slingsby, with five hundred foot, *burned*, *preyed*, *and destroyed* Owny O'Mulrian's country, and did the like to East Clanwilliam, Arloghwood's, and Muskeykwick, and KILLED EVERY SOUL HE FOUND THERE."[96]

* "They performed that service effectually, and brought the rebels to so low a condition, that they *saw three children eating the entrails of their dead mother*, upon whose flesh they had fed twenty days, and roasted it by a slow fire; and it was a

[96] Cox, 434.

as Hooker states, not only to eat horses, dogs, and dead carrion, but human flesh, and even to take carcasses from their graves.* It is a fact manifest, that *some older people had been in that starving condition, that they murdered and eat children, for a long time together*, and were at last discovered and executed for that barbarity. In short, *the famine of Jerusalem did not exceed that amongst the rebels of Ireland*."[97]

* "And as for the great companies of soldiers, gallowglasses, kerne, and the common people, who followed this rebellion, the numbers of them are infinite, *whose bloods the earth drank up, and whose carcasses the fowls of the air and the ravening beasts of the field did consume and devour*. After this followed *an extreme famine*: and such *whom the sword did not destroy, the same did consume and eat out*; very few or none remaining alive, excepting such as were fled over into England: and yet the store in the towns was far spent, and they in distress, albeit nothing like in comparison to them who lived at large; for *they were not only driven to eat horses, dogs, and dead carrions; but also did devour the carcasses of dead men*, whereof there be sundry examples; namely, one in the county of Cork, where, *when a malefactor was executed to death, and his body left upon the gallows, certain poor people secretly came, took him down, and did eat him*; likewise in the bay of Smeereweeke, or St. Marieweeke, the place which was first seasoned with this rebellion, there happened a ship to be there lost, through foul weather, and all the men being drowned, were there cast on land.

"The common people, who had a long time lived on limpets, orewads, and such shell-fish as they could find, and which were now spent; *as soon as they saw these bodies, they took them up, and most greedily did eat and devoure them: and not long after, death and famine did eat and consume them*. The land itselfe, which before those wars was populous, well inhabited, and rich in all the good blessings of God, being plente-

[97] Cox, 449.

worthy of observation, that Spencer coolly and deliberately proposed a plan for reducing the country, by the introduction of a new famine, which would force the natives "*to devour one another*,"* and renew the horrible scenes that had

ous of corne, full of cattell, well stored with fish and sundrie other good commodities, *is now become waste and barren, yielding no fruits, the pastures no cattell, the fields no corne, the aire no birds, the seas (though full of fish) yet to them yielding nothing.* Finallie, every waie the curse of God was so great, and *the land so barren both of man and beast*, that whosoever did travell from the one end to the other of all Munster, even from Waterford to the head of Smeerweeke, which is *about six score miles, he would not meet anie man, woman, or child*, saving in townes and cities; nor yet see anie beast, but the *very wolves, the foxes, and other like ravening beasts;* many of them laie dead, being famished, and the residue gone elsewhere."[98]

* "The end will (I assure me) bee very short, and much sooner than it can be in so great a trouble, as it seemeth hoped for, although there should none of them fall by the sword, nor bee slain by the souldiour; yet thus being *kept from manurance*, and their cattle from running abroad, by this hard restraint *they would quietly consume themselves, and devoure one another;* the proofe whereof I saw sufficiently in these late warres of Munster; for *notwithstanding that the same was a most rich and plentiful countrey*, full of corn and cattle, that you would have thought they should have been able to stand long, yet *in one yeare and a halfe they were brought to such wretchednesse, as that any stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they came creeping forth upon their handes, for their legges could not beare them; they looked like anatomies of death;* they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves; they *did eate the dead carrions, happy where they could find them, yea, and one an-*

[98] Hollinshed, VI. 459.

taken place during, and subsequent to, the hostilities against the earl of Desmond and his adherents, of which he draws such a hideous picture as makes the hair stand on end. There is nothing in the horrors of the French revolution, to exceed the calamitous events of this war of extermination.

## NOTE VI. ON CHAPTER II.

[F] P. 36. *Better suited incarnate demons.*] To palliate those enormities, of which the preceding notes afford some slight specimens, and to prove that the Irish were undeserving of any other fate than what they suffered, the English writers have exhausted the powers of language, in their reprobation and reproaches of the nation. From their accounts, it would appear that they were among the worst of the human species,*

*other soone after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves;* and if they found a plot of water-cresses or shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time; yet not able long to continue therewithall; that in short space there were none almost left, and *a most populous and plentiful country* SUDDAINLY LEFT VOYDE OF MAN AND BEAST."[99]

* "And here you may see the nature and disposition of this wicked, effrenated, barbarous, and unfaithful nation, who (as Cambrensis writeth of them) they are a wicked and perverse generation, constant in that they be always inconstant, faithful in that they be always unfaithful, trusty in that they be always

[99] Spencer, 165.

and combined together nearly all the bad qualities of all other nations. Among the most

treacherous and untrusty. They do nothing but imagine mischief, and have no delight in any good thing. They are always working wickedness against the good, and such as be quiet in the land. Their mouths are full of unrighteousness, and their tongues speak nothing but curses. Their feet are swift to shed blood, and their hands imbrued in the blood of innocents. The ways of peace they know not, and in the paths of righteousness they walk not. God is not known in their land; neither is his name called rightly upon among them: their queen and sovereign they obey not; and her government they allow not: but as much as in them lieth, do resist her imperial crown and dignity. It was not much above a year past, that captain Gilbert *with the sword so persecuted them*, *and in justice so executed them*, that then they in all humbleness submitted themselves, craved pardon, and swore to be for ever true and obedient; for such a perverse nature they are of, that they will be no longer honest and obedient, than that they cannot be suffered to be rebels. Such is their stubbornness and pride, that with a continual fear it must be bridled; and such is the hardness of their hearts, that with the rod it must still be chastised and subdued; for no longer fear, no longer obedience; and no longer than they be ruled with severity, no longer will they be dutiful and in subjection; but will be, as they were before, false, truce-breakers, and traitorous. Being not much unlike to mercury, called quicksilver, which let it by art be ne'er so much altered and transposed, yea and with fire consumed to ashes; yet let it but rest awhile untouched, nor meddled with, it will return again to its own nature, and be the same as it was at the first: and even so, daily experience teacheth it to be true, in these people. For *withdraw the sword*, *and forbear correction*, deal with them in courtesie, and intreat them gently, if they can take any advantage, they will surely skip out; and as the dog to his vomit, and the sow to the dirt and

rancorous and envenomed of those calumniators. Giraldus Cambrensis and Hooker claim a distinguished place.

puddle, they will return to their old and former insolence, rebellion, and disobedience."[101]

[101] Hooker, apud Hollinshed, VI. 369.

## CHAPTER III.

*Subject continued. Subornation. One thousand bills of indictment found in two days. Confiscation on a large scale.*

"Wo to them that devise iniquity, because it is in the power of their hand; *and they covet fields*, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away: so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage."——*Micah* ii. 1, 2.

I DO not pretend that all the depositions carry their own condemnation indelibly stamped on their foreheads, like those quoted in the preceding chapter. No: it would be very extraordinary indeed, if, among the army of perjurers, who were suborned for the purpose of swearing away the lives of the pre-condemned Irish, there were none who could frame a consistent story. But there is so much of undeniable fraud, and falsehood, and perjury established in the evidence, as to discredit the whole. He who swears that a man was "*cut*, and *hacked*, and *his entrails taken out*, *without bleeding*,"[102] must be a perjurer: but it does not thence follow, that he would have been other than a perjurer, had he omitted the miraculous part of the story.

[102] Temple, 88.

I said, "suborned for the purpose of swearing away the lives of the Irish." This is not a rhetorical flourish, calculated to delude or to deceive the reader. It is a melancholy and heart-rending truth, that such was the depraved and deplorable state of the morality of the administration in Ireland, that money was lavished to purchase evidence for the nefarious purpose above stated. And so barefacedly and profligately was this trade of corruption carried on,—so totally lost were the privy council to all sense of principle and decency,—and so well was their character established on this point, that one of the agents employed in the business of subornation, actually applied to them, in their public capacity, for the wages of his iniquity. This single fact, established on the unimpeachable evidence of the duke of Ormond,* would of itself be sufficient to induce

* "Indictments had been found against them" [Lord Dunsany, Sir John Netterville, and other noblemen and gentlemen of high standing] "and ABOVE A THOUSAND OTHERS, by a grand jury, IN THE SPACE OF TWO DAYS. There was certainly too much hurry in the finding of these indictments, (of which above three thousand were upon record) to allow *time for the examination of each particular case*, and they were *too generally found upon very slight evidence*. The Roman Catholics complained that *there were strange practices used with the jurors, menaces to some, promises of rewards*, AND PARTS OF THE FORFEITED ESTATES; and though great numbers of the indicted persons might be really guilty, *there was too much reason given to suspect the evidence*. I am the more inclined to suspect there was *a good deal of corruption and iniquity in the methods of gaining the indictments*, because I find a very re-

the world, *in any other history than that of Ireland*, to reject the whole of the evidence, even if it extended to one hundred folio volumes, instead of thirty-two, which are swelled to this immoderate extent, by silly tales of what "this body heard another body say."[103] But the history of Ireland is an exception to all the general rules on the subject of history. The allegations against the Irish have been so often reiterated,—so deep-rooted has been the hatred excited against the nation, and so deplorable has been the credulity of the world on this topic, that a fabulous tale, resting wholly on such incongruities and absurdities as we have seen, has been adopted, without investigation, by nine-tenths of those who have written on English or Irish affairs: and there are in this country, as well as in England, many, even among those who pride themselves on the extent of their reading, who are so far duped as to give as implicit credit to the story of the hundred and fifty-four thousand murdered in Ulster alone in

markable memorandum made by the marquis of Ormond, in his own writing, of a passage in the Council, on April 23, 1643. There was then a letter read at the Board, from a person who *claimed a great merit to himself, in getting some hundreds of gentlemen indicted*, and the rather for that he had *laid out sums of money to procure witnesses to give evidence* to a jury, for the finding those indictments. This was an intimate friend of Sir William Parsons, and might very well know that such methods would be approved by him."[104]

[103] Warner, 146. [104] Carte, I. 423.

three months, as to the account of the revolution of 1688, or the accession of the Hanoverian family to the throne of England.

I trust the reader will well weigh, and ponder on, the naked detail contained in the preceding note, which exhibits a scene of atrocity unparalleled in the history of fraud, forgery, and perjury. What a stupendous, what a sickening fact is the finding of *one thousand bills of indictment in two days!* And, be it observed, these bills were principally against the wealthy classes, the "noblemen, gentlemen, and freeholders."[105] These were the men whom it was worth while to indict, men whose estates would recompense the trouble, pay for the subornation of hired witnesses, and sate the avarice of the prime movers of the business.

Above one thousand bills of indictment in two days! Suppose the jury sat twelve hours in each day, from six in the morning till six in the evening, without obeying any of the calls of hunger, it was at the rate of *forty-two bills in an hour*, or *two every three minutes.* Well may Carte observe, that they did not "*allow time for the examination of each particular case.*" This is a most feeble mode of stating the affair, which he ought to have stigmatized in terms of the strongest reprobation. He might have said, and with perfect truth, that they did not "allow time to

[105] Carte, I. 454.

*read* the bills, and little more than was necessary to *sign* them." They must have been huddled over *en masse*, barely reading the titles, marking them *true bills*, (how *true*, heaven knows) and annexing the names of the jurors.

And these bills of indictment—(who can read the fact without shuddering?)—decided on the lives and fortunes of the principal of the "nobility, gentry, and freeholders" of Ireland, of whom, on these, and indictments *equally just and honourable*, "two thousand were prosecuted to outlawry by Sir Philip Percival, clerk of the crown,"[106] and their estates confiscated.

Will it be deemed extravagant, to assert that the annals of the world can produce no similar circumstance,—and that never was rampant and profligate injustice so completely triumphant? This was the time, when, in those halls nicknamed courts of justice, "the benches," (to use the strong and energetic language of the duke of Ormond, in his speech to the Irish Parliament) "were crowded or oppressed with the throng and *wicked weight of those who ought rather to have stood manacled at the bar*."[107] How deplorable the case of a noble nation, exposed to the "*tender mercies*" of such juries and such judges!

I intended to have closed this chapter with the above paragraph; but it appears that some further reflections are demanded on the subject. It

[106] Carte, I. 454. [107] Borlase, App. 84.

may not be improper, indeed it appears indispensable, to consider what is the nature of a bill of indictment, what are the duties of a grand jury who are to decide on it, and what are its consequences? Answers to these inquiries will bring the subject so fully before the reader, as to awaken him to the true character of the procedure which has occupied the chief place in this chapter.

According to Jacob's Law Dictionary, "An indictment is an inquisition taken and made by twelve men at the least, who are thereunto sworn, whereby they find and present that such a person, of such a place, in such a county, and of such a degree, hath committed such a treason, felony, trespass, or other offence, against the peace of the king, his crown, and dignity."[108]

The accusation is delivered to the grand jury, who are SWORN to determine on the probable guilt or innocence of the party accused, *according to the evidence* brought by the proper officer to support the charge.

Could the jury, who thus found ~~two~~ thousand bills of indictment in two days, have heard the evidence? Certainly not. Did they not therefore violate their oaths? Yes. What were they then? Perjurers. Was not the blood of every man, whom their perjury led to the scaffold, on their heads? Indubitably.

[108] Jacob, III. 401.

Were not the judges under oath to administer justice correctly? When they received such bills, were they not likewise perjured? Was not the blood of the victims equally to be laid to their charge? Most assuredly.

In ordinary cases, the perjuries of grand juries, however flagitious, are of no great importance, but as respects their own guilt, provided the traverse juries be upright and independent. Not so in that horrible age of perjury. There was hardly any traverse jury used: for the dread of the rack, and the exercise of martial law,* had so terrified the Roman Catholics, that they did not dare to venture into Dublin,† which was a complete den of murder.

* "The prisons of that city [Dublin] were now filled with prisoners: and, as the government increased in strength, were likely to be more crowded every day. It was troublesome, chargeable, and inconvenient to keep them, because of the consumption which it occasioned of victuals; which were already grown very scarce, and their numbers might prove dangerous, for which reason *the lords justices resolved to thin them.* It was difficult, or rather impossible, for want of freeholders, to find juries in the proper counties where the crimes were acted; so that there was no bringing these persons to a legal trial. In this necessity, it was determined to cause *a considerable number of them to be executed by martial law.*"[109]

† "It was certainly *a miserable spectacle*, to see every day *numbers of people executed by martial law, at the discretion, or rather caprice, of Sir Charles Coote, a hot-headed and bloody man*, and as such accounted even by the English and Protestants. Yet this was the man whom the lords justices picked

[109] Carte, I. 278.

This inference further follows, from the strong and unequivocal circumstance, that of three thousand persons indicted, as above stated, by Sir Philip Percival, there were two-thirds who did not appear, and were prosecuted to outlawry in their absence.* Thus, for those two thousand men, there was no more use of a traverse jury than if no such body ever existed.

Would that I had the tongue of a Demosthenes, or a Curran, or a Henry, or the pen of a Burke or a Dickinson, to spread this truth before an astounded world, that, on this species of evidence, one foul, bloated mass of fraud and perjury, rests the thousand-times-told story of "*the execrable Irish Rebellion*." The man who, knowing these

out to entrust with a commission of martial law, to put to death rebels and traitors, that is, all such as he should deem to be so; which he performed with delight, and a wanton kind of cruelty: and yet, all this while, the justices sat in council; and the judges, in the usual season, sat in their respective courts, spectators of, and countenancing, so extravagant a tribunal as Sir Charles Coote's, and so illegal an execution of justice."[110]

* "Whatever difficulties there were in the case, the lords justices were equal to them all; and carried on the prosecution with great vigour, causing indictments to be preferred not only against open and declared rebels, but also *against others who were barely suspected:* and, as there was *nobody to make defence, nor any great delicacy used, either in the choice of the jury, or in the character and credit of the witnesses, and one witness sufficed, such indictments were readily found.*"[111]

[110] Castlehaven, apud Carte, I. 279. [111] Carte, I. 277.

things, gives credit to the fable, ought to be confined for life to the edifying perusal of the voyages and travels of Sir John Mandeville, of Baron Munchausen, and their illustrious compeer, Sir John Temple.

## CHAPTER IV.

*Three civil wars. Different degrees of provocation. Different results.*

"Dat veniam corvis; vexat censura columbas."[112]

HE must be a superficial reader or observer, who requires to be informed how very different the reception the world affords to, how different the rewards and punishments it bestows on, acts absolutely similar. Instances occur daily, in public and private life: and among the extraordinary circumstances of the economy of human affairs, this is the most difficult to account for, or to reconcile to our ideas of eternal justice.

The three kingdoms subject to the crown of England, were the theatres of civil war, almost cotemporaneously. The consequences to the actors during their existence, and to their fame with posterity, were as different as light and darkness. Those who had every possible justification,—on whom had been perpetrated almost every species of outrage, paid the heaviest forfeit in fortune and in cotemporaneous and posthumous fame: whilst those whose grievances were comparatively insignificant, attained, living and dead, the highest honours, and many of them

[112] Juvenal.

aggrandized themselves to the full extent of their utmost wishes. This is not exactly as it should be: and though it is almost too late to correct the prevalent errors on the subject, to wash away the foul stains which avarice, religious bigotry, and national rancour, impressed on the sufferers, and though I may not therefore fully succeed, yet the attempt to effect these great objects can hardly be otherwise than useful.

Charles I. a bigot and a despot by education, wickedly endeavoured to force a new religion on the Scotch. In this, he only followed the examples of his predecessors, Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, who had successively either forced or persuaded their servile parliaments four times, in the course of about thirty years, to change the established religion.

Let it be observed, however, that the new religion was not the antipodes of the old one, as had been the case with the changes of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. The new religion bore many kindred features of the old: in points of doctrine they were nearly sisters, although there was the most marked difference in the church government. But I repeat, the difference between the religion that Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth found "*by law established*," and that they "*established by law*," was incalculably greater than between the religion of Scotland at the accession of Charles I. and the religion he attempted to force on his subjects.

An important consideration must not be passed over here. The Scotch laboured under hardly any other grievance than the contemplated innovation in their religion: their persons and property were sacred.

They resisted the despotic and wicked interference between them and their God: they were in the right: their cause was good. It is not given by the living God to any of the sons of men to force the religious worship of his fellow-men; and the attempt to change their religious opinions, is as transcendently absurd as would be the effort to "change the hue of the dusky Ethiop." Brutal force, as has been long since observed, may coerce men into apparent conformity; but it never made a convert yet,—and never will: it is fated to produce only martyrs or hypocrites.

The evil destiny of Charles induced him to raise forces to subdue the refractory Scotch. They obeyed the first law of human nature,—the law of self-preservation. They raised forces to defend themselves; and finally triumphed over the aggressor, and extorted from him a grant of every demand they chose to make. He was totally foiled; and retired from the contest, overwhelmed with shame and disgrace.

What has been the result, as respects the Scotch? They were honoured during their lives; were rewarded by the English Parliament with three hundred thousand pounds, and twenty-five thousand pounds monthly, for "*their brotherly*

*assistance*;"[A] and now stand in history as men who embarked in a holy cause, and were resolved to die or be free.

In 1642, a civil war took place in England, on various grounds, into the detail of which it is irrelevant to my present purpose to enter. That Charles I. was, in the first fifteen years of his reign, an arbitrary despot,—that the proceedings in the Star-Chamber Court were equally tyrannical and cruel,—that the fines in that court were oppressive, the punishments frequently most barbarous, the exactions of ship-money, tonnage, and poundage, illegal and unjust; and that they required and justified resistance, none but a cringing slave, deserving of the despot's lash, will deny. But it is impossible to read the history of that dark and disastrous period, with calmness and candour, without being convinced that all the substantial grievances of the nation were removed, and amply-adequate mounds established to guard against a recurrence of them, before a single soldier was raised, a single drop of blood shed, or a single step taken towards civil war or rebellion. In no country whatever was liberty more adequately secured, than it was by the laws enacted from the commencement of the Long Parliament, in November, 1640, till February, 1642. With every demand of Parliament during that period, Charles complied; sometimes, it is true, very reluctantly, and with an ill grace. But, till their claim of the power over the militia, he had refused them nothing.

The English, nevertheless, took up arms. Civil war spread its horrors over the nation, with its hideous train of demoralization and devastation. Torrents of blood were shed; conflagration, rape, rapine, and murder, prowled at large; the foundations of society were shaken: and the melancholy result was, to place the sceptre in the hand, and the crown on the head, of Cromwell, an unprincipled, canting hypocrite; and, after his death, to establish passive obedience and non-resistance, by an odious positive law, under one of the most licentious and profligate monarchs that ever disgraced the throne of England. And thus the leaders of that large, powerful, and respectable party that struggled for the liberties of the English nation, actually paved the way for a far worse state of things than existed at the period when the contest commenced.[B] To their intemperate violence, imprudence, and deficiency of political foresight, their country owed all its sufferings under the scandalous reign of Charles II. the very worst of the despicable race of the Stuarts. Had they stopped short, when they drew the teeth, and pared the nails, of despotism,—when they traced the strong line of demarcation between tyranny on one side, and anarchy on the other, they would have deserved eternal remembrance, and have conferred lasting and inestimable blessings on their country. And their improvidence places at their door, all the havoc and ruin, the demoralization, and destruction, of

a seven years' war,—the failure of a noble experiment in favour of the rights of human nature, as well as the triumph they afforded to the friends of absolute power, by the odious abuse of liberty. These stains can never be washed away.

What has been the result as to the actors on this stage?

They are to this day regarded with the highest veneration, by the most enlightened part of mankind. Their follies, their vices, their crimes, are buried in eternal oblivion. Their resistance to lawless tyranny has immortalized them.

The Irish, at the same period, suffered almost every species of the most grinding, odious, and revolting despotism that can be conceived. They were subjected to heavy penalties, for worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, or for not attending on a worship which they were taught to execrate; they were robbed of their estates by high-handed and flagitious tyranny and fraud; they were subject to martial law, with all its horrors, in time of profound peace; their juries were ruinously fined, and mutilated in their persons, for not finding verdicts against the plainest dictates of justice; their churches were demolished, or rapaciously seized by their oppressors; their children were torn from their natural guardians, and transferred to the care of worthless strangers, who squandered their estates, and brought them up in habits of licentiousness:—in a word, it is difficult to con-

ceive of any species of oppression which they did not endure.

They were goaded into insurrection. And if ever resistance of lawless outrage and tyranny were loudly and imperiously called for,—if ever the standard of freedom claimed the sympathies of mankind, the Irish standard had an indisputable title to it. And what has been the result? Their most illustrious families were reduced to beggary; their estates, to the amount of millions of acres, were confiscated; above half a million of the natives were slaughtered, banished, or perished by famine and the plague,* the consequence of the ruthless and savage ferocity with which they were pursued by their enemies; and they were covered with obloquy and abuse, during their lives; their memory has been detested; and the crimes falsely alleged against them, have been visited upon their descendants to the fourth and fifth generation, in the odious form of the vile code of laws, "*to prevent the growth of Popery.*"

The reader is requested to suspend his opinion on the subject of this statement, which is probably diametrically opposite to the opinions he has entertained from his youth. Ample proofs will be developed, in the chapters which immediately follow the present one. The most rigid scrutiny

* "About 504,000 of the Irish perished, and were wasted by the sword, plague, famine, hardship, and banishment, between the 23d of October, 1641, and the same day, 1652."[113]

[113] Petty, 18.

is earnestly invited; and assent is deprecated, and will be rejected, if the testimony be not decisive and overwhelming.

On the subject of the monstrous, absurd, improbable, and impossible legends of the massacre by the Irish, I have already slightly touched, and shall reserve for future chapters a more full detection of them. I now confine myself to the simple circumstance of the insurrection itself, stripped of all its horrors, real or pretended. And I dare aver, that if ever, from the creation of the world, there was a holy, sacred insurrection,—an insurrection warranted by every law, divine or human, this was pre-eminently so. Further: if the leaders of the Irish insurgents, who attempted to shake off the tyranny of England, were traitors and rebels, then were William Tell, Maurice, Prince of Orange, Pym, Hambden, and Sydney, traitors and rebels. One step further: if these Irishmen were traitors and rebels, Randolph, Henry, Hancock, Adams, Dickinson, Livingston, Lee, Rutledge, Clinton, and Washington himself, were traitors and rebels; and not merely traitors and rebels, but traitors and rebels of the most atrocious kind; as the difference between the grievances that Washington and his illustrious compeers rose to redress, and those under which Ireland groaned, is very nearly as great as that between the liberty and happiness of an American citizen, and the abject state of the subjects of Turkish despotism. Indeed, if the Irish insurgents

were traitors and rebels, then every man, in every age and country, who ever dared to raise his arm against oppression, was a traitor and a rebel.

This is strong language, which will doubtless be in direct hostility with the prejudices of a large portion of my readers. From their prejudices, I appeal to their reason and candour; and if the decision be made by these respectable arbiters, I feel no doubt about the issue. For, to confine myself to the American revolution, will any man, not lost to decency or common sense, dare to commit himself, by comparing the grievances of America with those of Ireland?—a two-penny tax on tea, with the court of wards, the Star-Chamber, the high commission court, the flagitious plunder of the whole province of Ulster, the attempt to confiscate the whole province of Connaught, the seizure of their churches, the banishment of their priests, the persecution of their religion, the restriction of their trade, the execution of martial law,—in a word, the endless detail of the most grievous oppression on record? If then the despotic and lawless imposition of a paltry tax on tea, warranted the subject in drawing the sword, and commencing a civil war, surely it is not assuming much, to say that the oppressions of Ireland warranted it far more. Indeed, it may be averred, and the decision submitted to any bar of enlightened men in Christendom, that were all the oppressions suffered by the American provinces, from the first landing of the pilgrims to

the declaration of independence, aggregated into one solid mass, and all the oppressions of England, under the Stuarts, thrown in to swell the amount, they would not equal the grievances suffered by the Irish, during the reigns of James I. and Charles I. And it is, moreover, hardly possible to find, in the history of Ireland, from the invasion of Henry II. till the Union, any five consecutive years, in which the Irish had not greater ground for insurrection and resistance to the English government, than England could plead in 1688, or America in 1775 or 1776.

---

## NOTE I. ON CHAPTER IV.

[A] P. 95. *Brotherly assistance.*] This very extraordinary fact has attracted the attention of few readers of English history. The money paid to the Scotch on this occasion, is generally confounded with the arrears paid them about five years afterwards, when they delivered Charles I. into the hands of the Parliament, after he had fled to their camp before Newark, on the final downfal of his affairs. This is a very great error: for, on the 21st of May, 1641, a resolution was passed in the English House of Commons, which explicitly voted this sum to the Scotch, under

the very remarkable title of "*brotherly assistance.*"*

Thus that very Parliament which so rancorously pursued the Irish to their utter ruin, and to the scaffold, for resistance to tyranny, lavished the wealth of their constituents on the Scotch, for similar resistance, without a tenth part of the provocation. If this do not warrant the motto of the crows and the pigeons, at the head of this chapter, it is truly wonderful.

A singular circumstance occurred, on taking the vote for the "*brotherly assistance.*" Mr. Jervase Hollis, in a debate on the best and speediest means of their payment, having said, "that he knew no better or fitter than by English arms to expel them the kingdom," was called to the bar, and expelled the house.[114]

Times soon changed. The Scotch, then such favourites, fell into disgrace in a few years. By

* *May* 21, 1641.

"Resolved, &c. That the whole arrear of 120,000*l.* be presently paid to the Scots, out of which the due debts of the counties are to be deducted; *and for the brotherly assistance of* 300,000*l.* it shall be settled and secured by the kingdom to them."[115]

"As a testimony of their *brotherly affections*, the two Houses had frankly undertaken to give them a gratuity of three hundred thousand pounds, over and above the twenty-five thousand pounds the month, during the time their stay should be necessary."[116]

[114] Frankland, 900. [115] Nalson, II. 255.
[116] Clarendon's E. I. 266.

a vote of the House of Commons, ten years afterwards, fifteen hundred of the prisoners of that nation were sold or given away to the Guinea merchants, to work in the mines.*

## NOTE II. ON CHAPTER IV.

[B] P. 96. *A far worse state of things than existed at the period when the contest commenced.*] It requires but little reflection or observation, to discover a considerable resemblance between the issue of this contest, and that of the late revolution in France; and that the leaders in both countries fell into exactly the same species of error, with results not very dissimilar. Had the Parliament of England stopped short at the point stated in the text, the liberties of that nation would have been placed, in 1642, on a far better and more secure foundation, than they acquired at the so-much-extolled revolution in 1688, when, on the abdication of the bigot James, they called in a foreign prince to rule them, with hardly any stipulation whatever in favour of liberty. And it is equally obvious, that had the French leaders rested content, when they gave the king a veto on the acts of

* *September* 20, 1651.

"Upon the desire of the Guinea merchants, fifteen hundred of the Scots prisoners were granted to them, and sent on shipboard, to be sent to Guinea, to work in the mines there."[117]

[117] Whitelock, 485.

the legislature, similar to what exists in England or the United States, the nation and the world at large would have been prodigiously benefited: and an incalculable waste of human happiness and wealth, rivers of blood, and millions of lives, would have been spared. But, according to the wise aphorism of the ex-president Adams, "Every age will make experience for itself."

## CHAPTER V.

*State of Ireland, under James I. and Charles I. previous to* 1641. *Awful credulity or imposture. Rancorous spirit of persecution. Sacrilegious burglary and robbery, by the archbishop, mayor, and recorder of Dublin.*

"Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?"

PREVIOUS to entering on the discussion of the insurrection of 1641, it is highly proper to cast a glance on the state of the nation previous to that event.

In order to aggravate as much as possible the guilt of the Irish, in what is styled "*the execrable rebellion of* 1641," and more completely to expose them to detestation, almost every writer, who has either professedly treated this subject, or touched it incidentally, has drawn a most flattering picture of the peace, prosperity, and happiness of Ireland, for forty previous years. It requires no deep research to discover, that the motive is to inspire a belief, that the insurrection was as wanton and unprovoked in its origin, as they have endeavoured to make it appear barbarous and sanguinary in its progress.

In this object they have been crowned with success: for the general impression is, that Ireland, during the reigns of James I. and his son Charles I. enjoyed a high degree of prosperity, to which she has been an utter stranger, from the day of the invasion by Henry II. when lust and faction laid the island prostrate at the feet of a foreign foe, to the present hour.

Sir John Temple first broached this deceptious tale. He states, that for forty years the two nations had lived together in peace, and been consolidated into one body, as one nation; that the Roman Catholics enjoyed the private exercise of their religious rites without molestation; and that none of the penalties of the laws against their religion were inflicted.*

* "The two nations had now lived together forty years in peace, with great security and comfort, which had in a manner consolidated them into one body, knit and compacted together with all those bonds and ligatures of friendship, alliance, and consanguinity, as might make up a constant and perpetual union between them.

"Their priests, Jesuits, and friars, *without any manner of restraint*, had quietly settled themselves in all the chief towns, villages, noblemen's and private gentlemen's houses, throughout the kingdom: so as *the private exercise of* ALL THEIR RELIGIOUS RITES AND CEREMONIES *was freely enjoyed by them, without any manner of disturbance, and not any of the laws put in execution*, whereby heavy penalties were to be inflicted upon transgressors in that kind."[118]

[118] Temple, 15.

This statement is copied and enlarged, by Clarendon,* Carte,† Warner, and Leland. They

* "Taxes, tallages, and contributions were things hardly known to them by their names. *Whatsoever their land, labour, or industry produced was their own*, being not only free from fear of having it taken from them by the king, upon any pretence whatsoever, without their own consent; but also secured against thieves and robbers, by due execution of good laws, that men might and did travel over all the parts of the kingdom, with great sums of money, unguarded and unconcealed.

"*The whole nation enjoyed an undisturbed exercise of their religion: and even in Dublin, where the seat of the king's chief governor was, they went as publicly and uninterruptedly to their devotions, as he went to his.* The bishops, priests, and all degrees and orders of secular and regular clergy, were known to be, and exercise their functions amongst them: and though there were some laws against them still in force, which necessity and the wisdom of former ages had caused to be enacted, to suppress those acts of treason and rebellion which the people frequently fell into, and the policy of present times kept unrepealed, to prevent the like distempers and designs, yet the edge of those laws was so totally rebated by the clemency and compassion of the king, that NO MAN COULD SAY HE HAD SUFFERED PREJUDICE OR DISTURBANCE ON ACCOUNT OF HIS RELIGION, which is another kind of indulgence than subjects professing a faith contrary to what is established by the law of the land, can boast of in any other kingdom of the world. *In this blessed condition of peace and security*, the English and Irish, the Protestants and Roman Catholics, lived mingled together in all the provinces of the kingdom, quietly trafficking with one another, *during the whole happy reign of James:* and from his death, every degree of their happiness was increased and improved under the government of his late majesty."[119]

† "The kingdom had enjoyed *a continued peace of near forty years*, during which the ancient animosities between the Irish

[119] Clarendon's I. 7, 8.

freely borrow not merely each other's sentiments, but their very phraseology. Lord Clarendon and Warner go much farther than the others; who, so far as religion is concerned in the question, only assert that the private exercise of it was permitted; whereas, lord Clarendon asserts, in the most unqualified manner, that the whole nation enjoyed *an undisturbed exercise of their religion: and even in Dublin, they went as publicly and as uninterruptedly to their devotions, as the king's chief governor himself to his.* Warner borrows this sentiment from lord Clarendon, but qualifies it in a small degree. He says "they went, *though not as publicly, yet as uninterruptedly, as the governor to their devotions.*"[120]

To this statement, the doctor makes, with Clarendon, this extraordinary addition; that "the edge of the laws against the Roman Catholics was so totally rebated by the lenity of the government, that *not a single man could say that he had suffered any prejudice or disturbance for*

and the English seemed to have been buried, and both nations cemented, and as it were consolidated together, by intermarriages, alliances, consanguinity, gossippings, and fosterings, (the two last being relations of great force and dearness among the Irish) and by a continued intercourse of acts of hospitality, service, and friendship: lands had been improved, traffic increased, and the kingdom in general raised to a more flourishing condition than it had ever known. THE ROMAN CATHOLICS ENJOYED THE QUIET EXERCISE OF THEIR RELIGION, IN A PRIVATE WAY."[121]

[120] Warner, 2. [121] Carte, I. 153.

*his religion.*"[122] It is hoped that the reader will bear this averment strongly in memory, throughout the succeeding pages, as well as lord Clarendon's "*undisturbed exercise*:" and I shall be most miserably disappointed, if the facts to be laid before him do not impair, if not wholly destroy, his confidence in the noble as well as the reverend writer.

Neither Temple's nor Clarendon's histories furnish any contradiction of these sweeping statements; so that, though erroneous, they are not inconsistent with themselves. But the declarations of Carte, Warner, and Leland, are in the most direct hostility with facts adduced throughout their own works: and, however extraordinary it may appear, my principal, if not my sole reliance for their overwhelming refutation, shall be on these three writers themselves. This is another instance of a peculiar feature in Irish history, which I have already noticed, that the facts and inductions of the writers, even of those most celebrated, frequently destroy each other. Either the facts must be wholly unfounded, or the inductions unwarranted.

The happiness, of which we have read such glowing descriptions, may be regarded under various points of view. Passing over those of minor importance, I shall confine myself to the four principal,—

[122] Warner, 2.

1. Freedom in the exercise of their religion.

2. Security of person.

3. Security of property. And

4. A fair representation in Parliament.

If the Irish enjoyed these solid advantages, when the insurrection commenced, then they deserved all the horrors inflicted on them, in the varied shapes of confiscation, proscription, pestilence, famine, and indiscriminate slaughter: and the writers whom I have quoted are justified completely in their assertions. But if they were, as I hope to prove, persecuted for the exercise of their religion, insecure in their persons, despoiled of their property, and mocked with a corrupt, packed, prostitute parliament; then are the statements of this host of authorities destitute of credibility: and they will in this instance, as in so many others, stand convicted of carelessness, credulity, or imposture. Their assertions, though propped up by the imposing titles of their noble and reverend authors, will, or, were they supported by the whole house of peers, including the bench of bishops, would, have no weight with men of independent minds, among whom, it is hoped, this work will find many readers.

I shall examine these items separately; and commence with a view of the state of religious freedom in Ireland.

I undertake to prove,—

I. That the law imposing penalties on persons refusing to take the oath of supremacy, or not

attending service in a Protestant church on Sundays, was rigorously enforced.

II. That juries, who would not find bills of indictment against Roman Catholics for this non-attendance, were brought before the Star-Chamber for the offence, as it was termed, and subjected to the injustice and severity of that odious tribunal.

III. That the heirs of Roman Catholics were torn from the protection of their natural guardians, and delivered to strangers, frequently worthless and profligate, who neglected their education, suffered them to grow up in abandoned and dissolute habits, and depredated on their property.

IV. That the Roman Catholics suffered a number of most grievous and oppressive disqualifications, in consequence of their adherence to their religion.

V. That the Roman Catholic clergy were banished the kingdom by proclamation.

VI. That, in the exercise of their religious worship, they were assailed by a band of soldiers, by order of the lord deputy, their altars sacrilegiously destroyed, and their church property feloniously purloined.

VII. That their chapels were rapaciously seized by the government, and one of them razed to the ground, in the city of Dublin, *as a punishment for their attendance on public worship.*

## POINTS I. & II.

To prove these points, I refer first to Leland, who states, that "when bills of indictment were presented against recusants, and were not found by the grand juries, those grand juries were cited to appear in the Star-Chamber, and punished."*

The good doctor informs us, with great gravity, and an appearance of astonishment, that this severity "*only increased the clamour.*" It is truly wonderful, and displays, beyond all question, the very refractory temper of the Irish, that they should have "*clamoured*" against such a mild exercise of the prerogative, as *punishing grand juries*, with the ordinary clemency of the Star-Chamber Court,[A] for the heinous offence of not finding bills of indictment against persons refusing to take the oath of supremacy, or attending on a species of worship contrary to their consciences!

The doctor further informs us, that the deputy, Oliver St. John, being actuated by peculiar zeal against Popery, or perhaps provoked by the insolence of the recusant party, "*proceeded to a*

* "The rich, when PRESENTED AS RECUSANTS, enjoyed too much of favour from their countrymen, for any jury to find a verdict against them; and *when jurors who found verdicts*, in direct opposition to the clearest evidence, *were called to the star-chamber*, (or castle-chamber, as it is sometimes called) *the severity only served to increase the clamour.*"[123]

[123] Leland, II. 516.

*vigorous execution of the penal statutes against them.*"*

We are left to conjecture what was the species of insolence that thus led this amiable first magistrate to the "vigorous execution" of these mild statutes. It was, perhaps, that they had the audacity to celebrate divine worship openly, or were guilty of some other crime, equally atrocious. But it is unimportant to our present purpose to inquire into the cause. All I desire to establish, is, that these penal statutes were "vigorously executed," in order to disprove the allegation that the Roman Catholics had for forty years "*the undisturbed exercise of their religion*," or even "*fully enjoyed the private exercise of it.*" But I do not, although I might, rely wholly on Leland. To support the reverend divine, I appeal to Carte, who informs us that Oliver St. John "*caused presentments to be made, in different parts of the kingdom, of such as neglected coming to church on Sundays.*"[124] It is not difficult to calculate what a harvest of penalties was reaped by pettifogging magistrates, and by the pimps, spies, and detestable race of informers, from these "*present-*

* "Whether provoked by *the insolence of the recusant party*, or that his nature and principles disposed him to treat them with less lenity than they had for some time experienced, HE SOON PROCEEDED TO A VIGOROUS EXECUTION OF THE PENAL STATUTES."[125]

[124] Carte, I. 34. [125] Leland, II. 540.

*ments in different parts of the kingdom;*" or what scenes of depredation were perpetrated on those Catholics, of whom Clarendon and Warner have been misguided enough to state, that "*no man could say he had suffered prejudice or disturbance on account of his religion!!!*"

Chichester's administration commenced with an extreme degree of severity. He had received orders from James I. to put the laws in force against recusants, with which he cheerfully complied.* "Gentle means failing to have any effect, sixteen of the most eminent of the city

* "In the beginning of king James's reign, the penal laws were put in execution against recusants, and indictments exhibited AGAINST THEM FOR NOT COMING TO CHURCH."[126]

"The chief governor and council were determined to revive those statutes which were *insulted with such confidence.*" [That is, in plain English, the miserable worm, man, was *insulted* by his fellow-worm worshipping the living God differently from the mode prescribed by law!] "They began by *enjoining the magistrates and chief citizens to repair to the established churches. Repeated admonitions and conferences served but to render them more obstinate;* THEY WERE FINED, AND COMMITTED TO PRISON."[127]

"*Magistrates and officers of justice were strictly required to take the oath of supremacy:* and as the city of Waterford had obstinately chosen a succession of recusants for their chief magistrates, who all in turn *refused to take this oath*, and in other particulars discovered an aversion to conformity; a commission issued, TO SEIZE THE LIBERTIES AND REVENUES of a city which had formerly and frequently been obnoxious to the state."[128]

[126] Carte, I. 140. [127] Leland, II. 495. [128] Idem, 540.

were convened into the Castle-Chamber, of whom nine of the chief were censured; six of the aldermen were fined each one hundred pounds; the other three, fifty pounds each: and were all committed prisoners to the castle, during the pleasure of the court. It was at the same time ordered, that none of the citizens should bear offices till they had conformed."[129] With this fact before his eyes, derived from the best authority, Leland affords an example of the most unaccountable inaccuracy, to use no stronger language. He informs us, that the *annual amount of fines* imposed on recusants in the county of Dublin, during the administration of lord Chichester, did not exceed the sum of fourteen or fifteen pounds;[130] whereas it appears that *at one time* nine persons paid seven hundred and fifty pounds sterling, in the city of Dublin alone: and we have every reason to presume, notwithstanding the silence of certain historians on the subject, that the law was enforced with equal rigour every where else. No reason can be assigned why, when the whole nation lay at the feet of those merciless oppressors, they would confine their rapacity to the precincts of Dublin. It is a well-known property of despotism, that its subordinate agents are always more arbitrary and oppressive than their principals; and it is therefore highly probable, as indeed is established by the testimony of

[129] Harris, 322. [130] Leland, II. 515.

cotemporary Roman Catholic writers, that the rapacity of the administration was at least equalled in every other quarter of the island.*

* "The Catholics of Ireland, on account of their greater number and opulence, had contributed more liberally to the above-mentioned, and all other supplies, than all the rest of his majesty's subjects of that kingdom; and the king, *instead of redressing their present grievances*, did, in a few months after the date of his letter of thanks above-mentioned, not only continue, but increase them, by giving particular instructions to Oliver St. John, then going over deputy, to put the statute of the 2d of Elizabeth, and all other penal statutes, in strict execution; instructions which Sir Oliver seemed very well inclined to pursue; for, at his entering on the government, he did indeed *proceed with vigour in the execution of that statute*, and *caused presentments to be made of such as neglected coming to church in different parts of the kingdom.* The effects of this rigour were dismal and extensive; *the treasures of the rich were thereby soon exhausted;* and the poor every where, not being able to pay this tax on their consciences, fled into dens, and caverns from the cruel collectors of it, whither they were sometimes pursued by the furious blood-hounds, set on and followed by a sheriff and his posse of disbanded soldiers, equally furious and unrelenting. Mr. Rooth, a cotemporary writer, informs us, that *in the poor county of Cavan alone, not less than eight thousand pounds were levied in one year, by means of this tax.* Ecclesiastical censures, on the same account, were severely executed in every part of the kingdom. Those who lay under them, when found abroad, were constantly thrown into jails; and great numbers of merchants and artificers, being thus confined at home, and hindered to transact business publicly, and in the way of open commerce, were suddenly reduced to poverty and distress. Even their dead bodies did not escape the cruelty of these censurers; for if they happened to die, while yet they lay under them, *they were denied Christian burial, and their corpses thrown into*

In these proceedings of the deputies, under the express direction of James I. there was a signal display of the base ingratitude that peculiarly characterized the wretched Stuart race, who, during the whole of their sway, were a curse and a scourge to Ireland. A short time previously, the Irish Parliament had unanimously voted that monarch uncommonly liberal supplies, for which he had, in his usual verbose style, ordered the deputy to return them his thanks. The Catholics were, as justly stated by Curry in the preceding note, as much more wealthy as they were more numerous than the Protestants; and of course were entitled, for their liberality, to some display of gratitude and lenity. But the only return made by the miserable king, was to issue orders, as we have seen, to the deputy, to enforce the execution of the unjust and wicked statutes against them.

Dr. Leland, discussing the oppressions and penalties which the Roman Catholics suffered, reasons with great sang froid on the folly of their subjecting themselves to such disadvantages, and appears to believe that there is no more difficulty in a change of religion, than in a change of the fashion of dress. He very philosophically states,

*holes, dug in the highways*, with every mark of ignominy that could be devised and inflicted by their bigoted judges."[131]

[131] Curry, I. 101.

that "men whose religious principles expose them to grievous disadvantages in society, are particularly bound to examine those principles with care and accuracy, lest they sacrifice the interests of themselves and their posterity to an illusion."[132]

This is a miserable cant, which applies with equal force and propriety to the case of all persecutors, of all ages and every country. Dioclesian, Nero, or Mahomet, might with equal propriety have held the same language to the unhappy objects on whom they wreaked their vengeance, as the Irish government. They might have said, while they were preparing their stakes and their flames, "You ought to examine with care and accuracy those principles which expose you to grievous disadvantages, and not to sacrifice your own interests, and those of your posterity, to an illusion." The idea of a nation laying aside, as *illusions*, those religious opinions which they had imbibed in infancy, and those practices to which they were habituated through life, and which "grew with their growth," would never have entered into the mind of any man who was not temporarily a dotard; and whatever might have been the ordinary range of Dr. Leland's mind, he must at that moment have been in a state of dotage.

132 Leland, II. 517.

## POINT III.

### *The Court of Wards.*

A very large portion of the exercise of the energies, the talents, and the industry of mankind, results from that holy regard to offspring, which pervades all animated nature, not excepting the most ferocious tenants of the woods; which is among the most powerful of the impelling motives of man and beast; and is wisely implanted by our Creator for the best purposes. Men of genuine parental feelings labour, with at least as much zeal, to secure independence and happiness for their offspring, as for their own proper advantage. But as if nothing holy or sacred could escape the violence and virulence of the Irish administration, in its dire hostility to the Roman Catholics, an attempt was made to cut up by the roots this inherent and instinctive principle, by the establishment of the court of wards, whereby the heirs of the Irish nobility and gentry were, on the decease of their parents, placed under the care of some court parasite, or person who bribed the court, and thus purchased the guardianship. Lord Orrery remarks, that the objections to the court of wards were, that "no man would labour for a child, who, *for aught he knows, may be sold like cattle in the market, even to those who will give most:* for," adds he, "SUCH ABUSES HAVE BEEN TOO OFTEN COMMITTED by those who have enjoyed the

bounties of their king."[133] This statement from lord Orrery, of the situation of the children of the Roman Catholics, who were "*sold in the market*" *to the highest bidder*, deserves the most marked attention; and, coming from the pen of a most rancorous enemy, establishes this point beyond controversy, and exhibits a species of oppression of which probably the world has beheld few examples.

Independent of the education of the heirs, the court of wards had a control over their marriage, of which they made a most iniquitous use; and frequently degraded and dishonoured them, by marriage with persons wholly unsuitable in point of character and family.*

In the Trim Remonstrance, the Roman Catholics make the most severe complaints against the exactions, injustice, and oppression of this court,

* "The wardship and marriage of the heir were likewise reserved to the crown. These lands and wardships were *usually granted to favourites*, and men of power and interest, who, though they gave security to the court of wards to take care, as well of the education and maintenance of the heir, as of the good condition of the estate, too often neglected both; *destroyed the woods, and committed horrible waste upon the lands; brought up the heir in ignorance, and in a mean manner unworthy of his quality; and*, SELLING HIS PERSON TO THE BEST BIDDER, *matched him unequally in point of birth and fortune, as well as disagreeably with regard to the character, qualities, and figure of the person that was picked out to be the companion of his life.*"[134]

[133] Orrery, I. 59. [134] Carte, II. 248.

whereby "the heirs of Catholic noblemen and other Catholics were most cruelly and tyrannically dealt withal, destroyed in their estates, and bred in dissoluteness and ignorance."*

To the same effect bishop Burnet writes of this court, that "families were often at mercy, and were used according to their behaviour. King James granted these guardianships generally to his servants and favourites; and THEY MADE THE MOST OF THEM; so that what was before a dependence on the crown, and was moderately compounded, *became a most exacting oppression, by which several families were ruined.*"[135]

* *Extract from the Remonstrance of the Catholics of Ireland, presented to his majesty's commissioners at Trim, March* 17, 1642.

The fourth item of their grievances, was

"The illegal, arbitrary, and unlawful proceedings of the said Sir William Parsons, and one of the said impeached judges, and their adherents and instruments in the court of wards, and the many wilfully erroneous decrees and judgments of that court, by which the heirs of Catholic noblemen and other Catholics were most cruelly and tyrannically dealt withal; destroyed in their estates, and bred in dissoluteness and ignorance; *their parents' debts unsatisfied; their younger brothers and sisters left wholly unprovided for;* the ancient appearing tenure of mesne lords unregarded; estates valid in law, and made for valuable considerations, *avoided against law; and the whole land filled up with the frequent swarms of escheators, feodaries, pursuivants, and others, by authority of that court.*"[136]

[135] Burnet, I. 16. [136] Plowden, I. App. 84.

The ostensible object of this iniquitous and oppressive court, was to educate the heirs of the great Catholic families in the Protestant religion, and thus "*prevent the growth of Popery:*" and their efforts to accomplish this grand object, reconciled the zealots of that period to the infraction of all the principles of justice and equity, and to the demoralization and ruin of the unhappy objects of their care.

## POINT IV.

### *Disabilities.*

The fourth point which I have undertaken to prove, is that the Irish Roman Catholics, as such, laboured under most severe and grievous restrictions and disqualifications.

The oath of supremacy is a virtual renunciation of the Roman Catholic religion; as it declares that the king of England is the supreme head of the church. It will not be denied, that this is as complete an abjuration as would be the oath of a Calvinist, that the Pope was supreme head of the Christian church.

Nevertheless, no person could, at that "blessed" period of "peace and security," when "*not a single man could say that he had suffered any prejudice or disturbance for his religion,*" without taking this oath,—

I. Act as magistrate in any corporation;

II. Take any degree of learning in the university;

III. Be admitted to plead at the bar in any of the courts;

IV. Fill any of the great offices of state;

V. Sue out livery of his lands, or ouster le main out of the hands of the king.*

These disqualifications, it is true, were not always enforced: indeed, in many cases, necessity constrained the government to connive at the non-enforcement of them. There were various parts of the kingdom, where the great mass of the people were Roman Catholics, and where there were so few Protestants fit for filling offices,

* "Nobody could be preferred to any degree of learning in an university, nor *sue livery of his lands*, or ouster le main out of the hands of the king, or do him homage in order to have possession of his estate, without first taking the oath [of supremacy.] In consequence thereof, *no peer or great man who refused it, could be admitted to the dignity of a privy counsellor*, or be advanced to any office of state *that might give him any share in the government of the kingdom. Nobody could legally act as a mayor or magistrate* in a corporation, without previously qualifying himself for those charges, by the taking of this oath."[137]

"The recusant lawyers, a powerful body of men, were angry that *they could not take degrees in law*, be made judges, or regularly admitted by any court *to plead at the bar*, without taking the oath of supremacy; though they probably gained as much by their *private advice* and *chamber practice*, with less trouble to themselves, and less hazard to their reputation, as they could have done by the *displaying of their eloquence in public*."[138]

[137] Carte, I. 43. [138] Ibid.

that they were obliged to admit Catholics into them. But the disqualifications were constantly in existence,—constantly held up in terrorem over the whole body,—frequently enforced with rigour,—and, in a word, called into operation, or suspended, just as suited the purposes of the rulers and their minions. The cases already stated, of fining the aldermen of Dublin, and of seizing "the REVENUES and liberties of the city of Waterford," for the offence of choosing magistrates who would not take the oath of supremacy, independent of numberless others to be found in the history of Ireland, in almost every page, bear me fully out in these propositions; and prove the sacred and delicate regard to truth, and the fidelity and research of lord Clarendon and Dr. Warner, when they state, that "not a single man could say that he had suffered any *prejudice* or disturbance on account of his religion."

Carte, to palliate the injustice and severity of the disqualifications of the recusant lawyers, offers a most extraordinary idea, in mitigation of the disadvantages arising from them. He informs us, as may be seen in the prefixed note, that they "*probably* [very *probably*, truly—and very wisely said] gained as much by their *private advice* and *chamber practice*," as they could have gained by being admitted to the bar; and (more consolation!) "*with less hazard to their reputation.*"

It is hardly necessary to point out the absurdity and futility of these opinions, and how desperate

must be the cause that is driven to such a defence. Suppose a decree were to pass, that all the lawyers throughout the United States, who are not six feet high, who have dark hair, or grey eyes, or aquiline noses, or fair complexions, were to be prohibited from pleading in our courts of justice—(and these criteria, though rather more whimsical, would be as just and correct as the criterion of religious opinions:)—And let us further suppose, that their complaints were met by the cogent and convincing answer, that "they would *probably* gain as much by *chamber practice* and *private advice*," as at the bar, and with "*less hazard to their reputation.*" What sentence would be pronounced against the man who oracularly delivered this opinion? He would be regarded, and with justice, either as a confirmed knave, or a consummate fool.

## POINT V.

*Banishment or suppression of the Roman Catholic clergy.*

During lord Clarendon's imaginary millenium, those forty years of "*blessed peace and security*," when "the whole nation enjoyed an undisturbed exercise of their religion," and "when no man could say he had suffered prejudice or disturbance on account of his religion," of the various proclamations against the Roman Catholic clergy, I

shall notice but two: one for their absolute banishment; and the other, in the most unqualified and intolerant manner, prohibiting them from the public exercise of their functions, throughout the whole kingdom. The first was issued by lord Chichester, in the commencement of the reign of James I.; and the second by lord Faulkland, early in the reign of his successor.

James, shortly after his accession, banished the Roman Catholic priests from Great Britain; and "by a like proclamation were the Popish clergy of Ireland commanded to depart within a limited time, *unless they consented to conform to the laws of the land*."[139]

"Unless they consented to conform to the laws of the land!" Here more is meant than meets the ear. Leland was too courtly to state that they were to "*depart*," unless they *abjured their religion*. But this, disguise it as we may, was the real fact.

The second proclamation is to be found in Rushworth, and does not bear any date;* but

* *Extracts from a Proclamation by Lord Faulkland, Lord Deputy of Ireland.*

"Forasmuch as we cannot but take notice, that *the late intermission of legal proceedings* against Popish pretended or titulary arch-bishops, bishops, abbots, deans, vicars-general, Jesuits, friars, and others of that sort, that derive their pretended authority and orders from the see of Rome, hath bred such *an extraordinary insolence and presumption in them, as*

[139] Leland, II. 495.

was issued, according to Borlase,[140] April 1st, 1629; is extremely rigorous; and goes the full

*that they have dared of late not only to assemble themselves in public places, to celebrate their superstitious services in all parts of the kingdom*, but also have erected houses and buildings, called public oratories, colleges, *mass-houses*, and convents of friars, monks, and nuns, in the eye and open view of the state and elsewhere.

"These are therefore to will and require, and in his majesty's name straightly to charge and command, all and all manner of such pretended or titulary arch-bishops, deans, vicars-general, arch-deacons, and others, deriving any pretended authority, power, or jurisdiction, or authority from the see of Rome, that they and every of them forbear from henceforth to exercise any such power, jurisdiction, or authority, within this kingdom; and that all such abbots, priors, Jesuits, friars, monks, and others of that sort as aforesaid, do forthwith *break up their convents and assemblies*, in all houses of friars, colleges, monasteries, and other places, wheresoever they are or shall be conventually or collegiately assembled together, within this kingdom, and to relinquish the same, and to disperse and separate themselves.

"And that all and every of the *orders before named, and other priests whatsoever, do from henceforth forbear to preach, teach, or celebrate their service, in any church, chapel, or other public oratory or place, or to teach any school, in any place or places whatsoever within the said kingdom.*

"And we do further charge and command all and singular the owners of such houses of friars, colleges, monasteries, schools, oratories, mass-houses, and nunneries, that they, and every of them respectively, in default of the persons before-named, their voluntary relinquishing of the said houses of friars, colleges, monasteries, schools, oratories, mass-houses, and nunneries, do forthwith *expel and thrust forth* all and singular such friars, Jesuits, and other monastical persons, out

[140] Borlase, 1.

length of suppressing the public exercise of the Roman Catholic religion altogether: for their priests were prohibited from "*celebrating their service in any church, chapel, or other public oratory or place whatever.*"

And to aggravate the severity of this proceeding, the proclamation was calculated to barbarize the nation, by debarring the great body of them of education, and thus bringing them up in brutal ignorance. The priests, who were at that period almost the only school-masters in the kingdom, were prohibited from "*teaching any school, in any place or places whatsoever in the said kingdom.*" The mind sickens, in tracing such constant, unvarying scenes of folly, wickedness, and tyranny, unrelieved by any thing that can afford consolation on reflection, or redeem the character of the government from richly-earned execration.

of the same; and do convert the same to more lawful uses, upon pain to have their said houses seized upon to his majesty's use; and *both the one and the other to be proceeded against for their unlawful assemblies, and maintenance of such unlawful conventicles* and nurtures of children, in the severest manner that by the laws and statutes of this kingdom, and ecclesiastical government of the same, may be had or extended; whereof they and every of them are to take notice, and to yield due obedience thereunto, as they and every of them will avoid his majesty's high indignation, and the consequence thereof."[141]

[141] Rushworth, II. 21.

## POINTS VI. & VII.

To establish these two points, it will be sufficient to state one strong circumstance of sacrilegious violence, which would have disgraced a band of Algerines or Ostrogoths; and which, unaided by the preceding details, would settle this question for ever.

A congregation of Roman Catholics were assembled in a chapel in Dublin, to adore the Living God, and to commemorate the death of that Jesus Christ whom the government worshipped. This daring act, of a people who "*enjoyed the undisturbed exercise of their religion*," and of whom "*no man could say he had suffered prejudice or disturbance on account of his religion*," excited as much indignation among the Privy Council, as if they had been engaged in some most abominable plot. The justices accordingly despatched to the chapel a host of sacrilegious ruffians, of whom, to their eternal dishonour, the leaders were the archbishop, the mayor, and recorder of Dublin. They entered the chapel, in the midst of divine service; *dragged the priest from the altar; hacked and hewed the images and other ornaments;* and, like common robbers, purloined the crucifixes, copes, and chalices, and other valuable articles.*

* "In this year, the Roman clergy began to rant it, and to exercise their fancies called religion, so publicly *as if they had gained a toleration:* for whilst the lords justices were at

The insulted congregation, as soon as their amazement and terror at this lawless outrage had subsided, attempted to defend their altar, their priest, and their worship: but, as might be expected, they were defeated by the soldiery, and many of them committed to prison, with the priests and friars.

Of this atrocious act, of which every one of the perpetrators ought to have been shot, flagrante delicto, as sacrilegious burglars, it might be expected that the historians would express the utmost reprobation and indignation. No such

Christ's church, in Dublin, on St. Stephen's day, *they were celebrating mass in Cook street;* which their lordships taking notice of, *they sent the archbishop of Dublin*, *the mayor*, *sheriff*, *and recorder of the city*, with a file of musqueteers, to apprehend them; which they did, *taking away the crucifixes and paraments of the altar; the soldiers hewing down the image of St. Francis;* the priests and friars were delivered into the hands of the pursuivants, at whom the people threw stones and rescued them; the lords justices being informed of this, sent a guard and delivered them, *and clapped eight Popish aldermen by the heels*, *for not assisting their mayor.* On this account, *fifteen houses*, by direction of the lords of the council in England, were seized to the king's use; and the priests and friars were so persecuted, that two of them hanged themselves in their own defence."[142]

" The lords justices sent the archbishop, the mayor, sheriff, and recorder of the city, to apprehend them, which they did; TAKING AWAY" [that is, *piratically plundering*] " *their crucifixes*, *chalices*, *and copes*, and delivering the friars and priests into the hands of the pursuivants."[143]

[142] Hammond L'Estrange, apud Curry, I. 115.
[143] Baker, 469.

thing, reader. They appear to justify the malefactors, and to throw the whole censure on the wretched and oppressed people, whose sole crime was worshipping the Living God according to the dictates of their consciences.

It is impossible to read, without indignation, the manner in which this flagitious proceeding is noticed by Carte and Leland. The former states, that the recusants "took greater liberties, *in contempt of the law*," than the state could "*indulge them in*," or they practise with prudence. They were not satisfied with "*the enjoyment of their religion in a private way*;" they "*must do it in a public manner*:"[144] and "when the magistrates attempted to apprehend the priest, he was rescued, with *horrid affronts* to the archbishop and mayor, under the *very nose* of the government." It is a lasting disgrace to "*the nose* of the government," that it did not *smell out* the real malefactors, and punish them, instead of despatching them on so foul an errand.

It is difficult to conceive of a stronger instance of historical chicane than is here displayed; and it is a fair specimen of the manner in which Irish history is generally written. The enormities perpetrated on the Irish are softened down or palliated, and many of them wholly omitted; while the magnifying powers of the microscope, or the inventive talents of Munchausen, are ap-

[144] Carte, I. 53.

plied to depict the Irish as objects of abhorrence. Had the Roman Catholics been engaged in some dangerous conspiracy to subvert the government; in the act of enlisting soldiers for that purpose; or had they in preparation some "*infernal machine*" to blow up the castle, it might be said, that "*they took greater liberties than the state could indulge them in.*" But to use such language, to mark with reprobation the mere act of assembling peaceably to worship God in the manner practised in their country, and throughout the whole of Christendom, for ages, displays, quoad hoc, a most disgraceful illiberality: and to feign such strong sensibilities for the "*horrid affront*" put upon *a mitred ruffian*,[B] who was resisted in a sacrilegious attack upon the altars of the Living God, is inexpressibly disgusting; and, in any independent court of literature, would be sufficient to have the writer expelled from the honourable corps of historians.

Leland informs us, that "*the incident*," (that is, the attack on the priest, the altar, and the congregation, and the resistance on the part of the Catholics) "was represented in England in the most offensive manner, and seemed to reproach *that mistaken lenity* which had encouraged the recusants to *this outrage*:" that is, gentle reader, "*the outrage*" of repelling a savage assault, that, as I have stated, would have disgraced an Algerine or an Ostrogoth. "It was deemed neither safe nor politic to connive at *such insolence!* By

an order of the English Council, fifteen religious houses were seized to the king's use: and the Popish college, erected in Dublin, was assigned to the university, which for the present converted it into a Protestant seminary."[145]

Such is the miserable manner in which the hotch potch, palmed on the world as history, is written. An outrage which imperiously required the most glowing language of abhorrence and reprobation, that could flow from the pen of a Tacitus, a Juvenal, or a Junius, is not merely glossed over as pardonable, but apparently commended as meritorious: and those in whose persons the most sacred rights are violated, and who are rapaciously despoiled of their altars and their temples, are held up to reprobation as criminals: and this by writers who enjoy no small degree of reputation;—how well deserved, the world will judge.

Suppose that we admit for a moment, (and the admission must be but momentary) that a paltry minority of a nation, two-thirteenths of the entire population,* have a right to proscribe the great majority from any particular form of worship; to inflict penalties on its exercise; and to dictate any other that may seem meet to them: suppose that the worship practised at the chapel were manifestly illegal: or even suppose it were absolutely

* "Before the war, the proportion was as two to eleven."[146]

[145] Leland, II. 8. [146] Petty, 18.

idolatrous, and that, instead of worshipping the Living God, they were actually worshipping idols, the work of men's hands, "that have eyes and see not, ears and hear not." Can there, even under all these suppositions, be a shadow of defence pretended for the choice of the time, the place, and the manner of perpetrating this act of violence? There was probably no other country under the canopy of heaven, but Ireland, where such odious sacrilege would have been perpetrated, or allowed to pass with impunity, under the auspices and by the direction of the government.

The intent of this base procedure is unambiguous: it speaks its true character clearly and unequivocally. It was an effort to provoke the wretched people to insurrection, in order to renew again the scenes of confiscation and proscription, which fill the sickening and heart-rending pages of the history of that ill-fated country. If this had not been their intention, they would have let the worship pass over; waited till next day; and then proceeded against the "*idolatrous Papists*," in due course of the *mild* laws of the country.

When the intelligence reached the court of king Charles, instead of recalling the justices, who had abused their trust by promulgating such orders, and punishing the perpetrators of the outrage, he issued a proclamation, whereby he became particeps criminis; and, to punish the outraged people for the guilt of their oppressors, ordered the

chapel where the sacrilege had been perpetrated to be razed to the ground, and the oppressed Catholics to be robbed of the rest of their places of worship.*

* *Extracts from a Letter to the Lords Justices and Council of Ireland, dated January* 31, 1629.

"By your letters, we understand how the seditious riot, moved by the friars and their adherents at Dublin, hath by *your good order and resolution been happily suppressed.* And we doubt not but by this occasion you will consider how much it concerneth the good government of that kingdom, to prevent in time the first growing of such evils: for where such people are permitted to swarm, they will soon make their hives, and then endure no government but their own, which cannot otherwise be restrained, than by *a due and seasonable execution of the laws*, and such directions as from time to time have been sent from his majesty and this board.

"And such magistrates or officers, if any shall be discovered, that openly or underhand favour such offenders, or do not their duties in suppressing them, and punishing the offenders, you shall do well to take all fit and safe advantages, by *the punishment or displacing of a few*, to make the rest more cautious. This we write not as misliking the fair course you have taken; but to express the concurrence of our judgment with yours, and to assure you of our assistance on all such occasions wherein for your further proceeding we have advised, and his majesty requireth you accordingly to take order, first, that THE HOUSE WHERE SO MANY FRIARS APPEARED IN THEIR HABITS, and wherein *the reverend archbishop and the mayor of Dublin received their first affront*, BE SPEEDILY DEMOLISHED, and be a mark of terror to the resisters of authority: and that *the rest of the houses erected or employed there or elsewhere in Ireland, to the use of superstitious societies*, be converted into houses of correction, and to set idle people on work, or to other public uses, for the advancement of justice, good art, or trade.

When such ruffian violence was perpetrated by a grand dignitary of the church, in the capital, by order of those who held the reins of government, and afterwards received the marked approbation of the British administration, it is easy to conceive to what extent the example would be followed throughout the kingdom; how deplorable was the situation of the Catholics; what a wretched chance of redress they had for any wrong or violence perpetrated on them; and what a loathsome tissue of fables every man, not destitute of truth, honour, honesty, or candour, must pronounce those histories, which, for the most sinister purposes, boldly state the gross, the palpable falsehood, that "the whole nation," for forty

"And further, that you use all fit means to discover the founders, benefactors, and maintainers of such societies and colleges, and certify us their names. And that *you find out the lands, leases, rents, or revenues applied to their uses, and dispose thereof according to the law.* And that you certify also the places and institutions of all such monasteries, priories, nunneries, and other religious houses, and the means of all such persons as have put themselves to be brothers or sisters therein, especially such as are of note, to the end such evil plants be not permitted any more to take root in that kingdom, which we require you to take care of.

| | |
|---|---|
| Lord Keeper. | Earl of Salisbury. |
| Lord Treasurer. | Earl of Kelley. |
| Lord President. | Lord Viscount Dorchester. |
| Lord Privy Seal. | Lord Newburgh. |
| Lord High Chamberlain. | Mr. Vice Chancellor. |
| Earl of Suffolk. | Mr. Secretary Cook. |
| Earl of Dorset. | Sir William Alexander."[147] |

[147] Rushworth, II. 33.

years, previous to 1641, "*enjoyed the undisturbed exercise of their religion: and even in Dublin, where the seat of the king's chief governor was, they went as publicly and as uninterruptedly to their devotions, as he went to his.*"[148] This falsehood is destitute of the slightest defence or extenuation. It is not on an abstruse, doubtful, or contested point, where, even with the best intentions, error is not easily avoided, and where, of course, error is pardonable. It respects facts of the utmost notoriety, to be found by the most cursory glance on the very surface of history: and it is not extravagant to assert, that lord Clarendon, when he lent the weight of his name to the story, and committed this sweeping declaration to paper, must have known that he was flagrantly violating the ninth command of the decalogue, and "bearing false witness against his neighbour," to blacken the already-too-much-defamed character of the persecuted, oppressed, and pillaged Roman Catholics: for it was utterly impossible for him to have been so conversant with public affairs, or to have read history as he must have done, without being thoroughly acquainted with the infinite variety of pains, penalties, and disqualifications, under which the Roman Catholics laboured in both kingdoms; and which were as utterly incompatible with the state of things he

[148] Clarendon's I. 8.

depicted, as light and darkness, heat and cold. vice and virtue, are incompatible with each other.

L'Estrange, whom I quote for this fact, is disposed to be witty on the subject. He states, that "the priests and friars were so persecuted, that two of them hanged themselves, *in their own defence.*" This is a truly novel mode of self-defence. It is, however, far more probable, and almost certain, that some bloodthirsty and fanatical ruffians, inspired by "*a holy abhorrence*" of the "superstitious idolatries and abominations of Popery," and availing themselves of the infuriated spirit of the government, seized these unfortunate men privately, and hanged them up, without judge or jury. Of the sanguinary spirit of mobs and factions, when merely connived at by the constituted authorities, and still more when countenanced and excited by them, the world has had many calamitous instances, in ancient and modern times; among which, the Roman proscriptions, and the Parisian Septembrization, stand pre-eminent. But whether those priests died by suicide or murder, is of little importance here: my object being to prove the existence of the persecution of a people, of whom, I beg leave once more to repeat, lord Clarendon and Warner made the extravagant declaration, that "no man could say that he had suffered prejudice or disturbance on account of his religion!!!"

Let it be observed, that Borlase in his Reduction of Ireland,[149] and Baker in his Chronicles, both state the fact to nearly the same effect as L'Estrange. Baker informs us, that "most of their houses of religion were immediately seized into the king's hands; and such inquisition made after the rest, that two priests hanged themselves at the apprehension of this *(as they called it)* persecution."[150]

This parenthetical sentence "as they called it," demands attention. It can have but one meaning, which is, that the writer did not himself believe or admit that this was a persecution. It is really wonderful, that the idolatrous Papists should be so absurd as to *call it a persecution.* Had any such depredation, indeed, been perpetrated on the reformers in England or Scotland, it would have truly been a persecution: but against idolatrous Papists, it was nothing more than a due execution of a necessary law, intended to put a period to their "*idolatry.*"

The wickedness of this procedure is so great, that it needs no aggravation: and yet it is attended with circumstances which greatly enhance its deformity, and throw the character of the "*royal martyr*,"[c] as Charles I. is absurdly styled, into deep shade, and prove him to have been both perfidious and ungrateful: perfidious, because he openly violated a solemn engagement; and ungrateful, because, in return for signal ser-

[149] Borlase, R. 207. [150] Baker, 469.

vices rendered by his Catholic subjects, he issued the lawless and piratical order for plundering them of their chapels.

In 1627, the affairs of this monarch were in a most deranged state. He was engaged in a war with France, deeply in debt, and much distressed for resources, which he could not prevail on Parliament to afford. In this emergency, the Irish Roman Catholics offered to support constantly five thousand foot and five hundred horse, provided they were *indulged with a mere toleration of their religion*, and some other favours of minor importance.*

This proposition excited a most awful outcry. The archbishop of Armagh, the celebrated Usher, and all the other dignified clergy of the established church, with a most miserable spirit of bigotry and intolerance, worthy of that persecuting and fanatical age, but disgraceful to the actors, entered a most solemn protest† against the mea-

* "The toleration they desired was no more than some respite from the oppressions and extortions of the ecclesiastical courts; and to have all proceedings against them in those courts, for religion, suspended; to be released from those exorbitant sums which they were obliged to pay for their christenings and marriages; and particularly to have the extravagant surplice fees of the clergy, and the extraordinary warrants for levying them, abolished."[151]

† "The religion of the Papists is *superstitious and idolatrous;* their faith and doctrine *enormous and heretical;* their church, in respect to both, *apostatical. To give them, there-*

[151] Curry, I. 109.

sure, as "an abomination and toleration of idolatry; and as being *accessary to the perdition of the seduced people who perish in the deluge of the Catholic apostacy*." It is too obvious to need enforcement, that if the Catholics enjoyed the "*undisturbed exercise of their religion*," it would have been unnecessary to offer so high a price for *a mere toleration:* nor would the attempt to procure it have produced such a clamour.

Notwithstanding this intolerant opposition, a regular compact was entered into, some time

*fore, a toleration*, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion, and profess their faith and doctrine, *is a grievous sin*, and that in two respects; for first it is to make ourselves accessary not only to *their superstitious idolatries and heresies*, and in a word to all *the abominations of Popery*, but also (which is a consequent of the former) *to the perdition of the seduced people which perish in the deluge of the Catholic apostacy;* secondly, to grant them a toleration in respect of any money to be given, or contribution to be made by them, is *to set religion to sale, and with it the souls of the people, whom Christ hath redeemed with his blood.* And as it is a great sin, so it is also a matter of most dangerous consequence, the consideration whereof we commit to the wise and judicious, beseeching the God of Truth to make them, who are in authority, zealous of God's glory, and of the advancement of true religion; zealous, resolute, and courageous against *all Popery, superstition, and idolatry*."

| | |
|---|---|
| James Armachanus. | Andrew Alackdens. |
| Mal. Casellen. | Tho. Kilmore and Ardagh. |
| Anthony Medensis. | Theo. Dromore. |
| Tho. Fern and Leghlin. | Mic. Waterford and Lismore. |
| Robert Dunensis. | |
| Richard Corke. | Fra. Limerick.[152] |

[152] Rushworth, II. 22.

afterwards, between Charles I. and the Irish Catholics, whereby they pledged themselves to remit the sum of one hundred and fifty thousand pounds, which they had loaned him; and also to grant, in the three ensuing years, three subsidies, each of forty thousand pounds;* with which they religiously complied. In return, Charles engaged to grant them sundry graces, as they were styled, or, in strict propriety of speech, to remove sundry oppressions under which they groaned. This was as fair a contract as was ever arranged; and was most shamefully evaded by Charles.

These graces were to be digested by the Irish Parliament into acts, which were to be ratified,

* "The humble petition of your majesty's subjects, appointed agents to prefer certain humble requests and petitions to your highness, in the behalf of your kingdom of Ireland,

"Humbly sheweth:

"That your majesty's suppliants did, in behalf of your subjects of Ireland, offer unto your majesty to remit and release unto your highness 150,000*l.* or thereabouts, already borrowed from them, or paid to your majesty's army there; and further to grant three subsidies, to be paid in the next three years, which humble offers your petitioners are now duly authorized to make; as also to present certain humble requests to your highness, according to the instructions given them of your majesty's faithful subjects of your kingdom of Ireland; which offers, though they do not extend to that greatness as from your highness's other more flourishing kingdoms may be expected, yet, considering the state and poverty of the said kingdom, they are as much as the subjects are possibly able to afford at this time."[153]

[153] Rushworth, II. 17.

in the usual form, by the British Privy Council. Lord Faulkland accordingly summoned a Parliament to meet for the purpose of carrying the contract into effect: but, by two acts of Parliament, passed under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, it was ordained that no Parliament should be held in Ireland, without "license obtained of his majesty, under the great seal of England;" and with this formality Lord Faulkland had not complied, very probably, as Leland clearly intimates,[D] by collusion between the monarch and his deputy. The Privy Council of England, determined not to waive any of their privileges, applied to the bench of judges for their opinion on the subject, who pronounced the summons illegal and void.*

That this was a collusion on the part of the prince, is reduced as near to certainty as in such a case is practicable. Had he been sincerely disposed to perform his engagements, he could in one hour have removed the difficulty; and, as an honest man, he ought to have done it. But he was so far from this display of honour and

* *Extract from the Opinion of the Judges.*

"We have taken into our consideration the lord deputy's commission, wherein he hath power given him to summon the Parliament; but that is limited to be according to the laws, statutes, and customs of that kingdom, and with the king's consent first had, and not otherwise; which hath not been observed in the summons of this intended Parliament, in any of the points before-mentioned; and therefore *this summons, notwithstanding that power, is illegal and void.*"[154]

[154] Rushworth, II. 20.

integrity, by remedying the error, and calling a Parliament immediately, that none was held for six years afterwards.

The laxity of the early writers or compilers of history on the subject of dates, renders it difficult to fix the chronology of these facts with accuracy. It shall be done as far as practicable.

The commission to the Irish agents who carried on the negotiation, is dated August, 1627; and they arrived in London in September of that year.

The negotiation probably lasted two months. I cannot find the date of lord Faulkland's summons: but the Parliament was to have met in November, 1628. The opinion of the judges is dated, "Sergeant's Inn, October 2, 1628;" and the vote of the Privy Council against the meeting of the Parliament, which does not appear in Rushworth, probably issued immediately. But instead of the promised, the dearly-purchased graces, lord Faulkland, early in the following year, issued the most outrageous proclamation, commanding all the priests, monks, and friars to disperse themselves, and to give up their convents, colleges, monasteries, and other places where they collegiately or conventually assembled; of which the substance may be seen in page 126.

The sacrilegious burglary which has been detailed in page 129, and which took place in 1629, arose from, and was a natural consequence of, this proclamation, which was obviously intended to lead to such consequences, and to the depre-

dations subsequently perpetrated, throughout the kingdom, on the chapels and other religious establishments of the Catholics.

That this whole affair is as complete an exemplification of the *Punica fides* as history can produce, will hardly be denied by any candid man in Christendom.

---

## NOTE I. ON CHAPTER V.

[A] P. 112. *Star-Chamber Court.*] Although the Star-Chamber Court is introduced times without number into English and Irish history, few have other than a very vague idea of the horrible injustice of its proceedings. I quote from Rushworth the sentence pronounced on a certain Fitzharris, by lord Suffolk, one of the judges in the English court, of this title, as a specimen of its lenity and humanity :

"My lord of Suffolk agreed with my lord Cottington ; and added this, to have Fitzharris lose *one ear in England; another in Ireland;* and if he have a third ear, to lose it in Scotland."[151]

The case which afforded this wonderful display of clemency, was as follows : lord Strafford, who was excessively intemperate and violent, was

[151] Rushworth, III. 896.

offended by a certain Robert Esmond; and, according to the depositions of some bystanders, threatened him with his stick,—or, as is more probable, according to the depositions of others, struck him with it on the head. Esmond died shortly afterwards; and, according to general belief, of the stroke of the stick. Be that as it may, the report gained ground; and Fitzharris, among others, had mentioned the circumstance, and the rumours respecting it. For this, he and a number of persons were cited before the Star-Chamber Court. He was found guilty, and the above sentence pronounced on him by one of the judges. The other persons accused were most ruinously fined.

## NOTE II. ON CHAPTER V.

[B] P. 136. *The horrid affront on a mitred ruffian.*] This style of expression towards so elevated a character as an archbishop, will offend the eyes and the ears of some delicate readers, who will regard it as shocking and indecorous. But I have not lightly adopted it. I have well weighed the matter, before I determined to use it; and, instead of any apology, make no scruple to avow, that did the English language afford terms of reprobation stronger and more significant, but not scurrilous, I should have used them. If an archbishop, a governor, a president, a king, or an emperor, be not ashamed to act like a *ruf-*

*fian*, ought we to be either afraid or ashamed to style him a ruffian? Whatever scruples others may have on this subject, I have none. I have called, and shall continue to call, throughout this work, men and things by their proper names, regardless of titles or dignities: and, believing that the crime here perpetrated was only second to murder, and that none but a ruffian would contemplate, none but a ruffian order, and none but a ruffian undertake its commission, I unhesitatingly incur the responsibility of designating it by its peculiarly appropriate phrase. Indeed, the higher, the more exalted the perpetrator, the more justice and propriety there is in marking the deed with the strongest language. Can any terms be too strong to stamp the guilt of a minister of the Living God, leading a furious mob to destroy the altars of that Living God? "A ruffian," according to Sheridan, is "a brutal, boisterous, mischievous fellow!" And would any but a most "*brutal, boisterous, mischievous fellow*" head a licentious band of mercenary soldiers, in an attack upon an unarmed and defenceless body of men, women and children, in the solemn act of worshipping the Living God, or deface and destroy his altars, and purloin the ornaments consecrated to his worship? Were the question taken on this point among a million of candid men, there would, I feel confident, be an unanimous negative vote.

## NOTE III. ON CHAPTER V.

[c] P. 139. *Royal martyr.*] In one particular sense, there is some slight appearance of justice in this designation. During the protracted negotiation with the parliament, while Charles I. was a prisoner, he might have made terms with them, had he consented to abandon Episcopacy, and to establish the Presbyterian religion. His pertinacious rejection of this proposition, lost him the support of those who would otherwise probably have once more placed the sceptre in his hands.

## NOTE IV. ON CHAPTER V.

[D] P. 142. *As Leland clearly intimates.*] At every step of our progress through the Irish history, we have to lament and censure the disingenuity of the writers—the *suppressio veri*—the lenity they extend to the oppressors of Ireland, and the severity with which they animadvert on the guilt, real or supposed, of the Irish. This is a striking case. Charles, as stated in the text, made a fair contract with his Irish subjects. They honourably performed their part. An informality prevented his immediate compliance. That informality it was in his power to remove, by issuing a license for the meeting of the Irish Parliament, and taking order that all the requisite forms should be observed: and his failure to adopt this measure, was as base and as fraudulent, as it

would be for a private person, who had sold a house, or a piece of land, and received the price, to refuse to make the deed, or convey the property. And how does Leland record this shameful fact? Why he smoothly informs us, that "*the king's sincerity appeared at least suspicious*."[152] And further: "The king stood engaged, that his graces should be confirmed by a law of Parliament: and the *insincerity of his professions was not yet completely discovered*."[153] Had such a transaction taken place on the part of the Irish, all the powers of language would have been exhausted to brand them with infamy.

The duplicity of Charles was made manifest, a few years subsequent to this period; and stands recorded in his own hand-writing. The administration of Ireland was, anno 1633, confided to lord Strafford, who was induced, by the embarrassment of the king's affairs, to call a Parliament, for the purpose of raising a revenue for his master. There was a considerable difficulty in the way, to evade the sacred pledge given by Charles, and to keep the Irish in temper, without performance of the contract. Strafford, bold, daring, and unprincipled, took upon himself the odium of the non-compliance, asserting publicly to Parliament, that he had not communicated their demands to Charles; although his own letters, since published, prove this to have been

[152] Leland, II. 570. [153] Idem, III. 3.

a flagrant falsehood. Charles, delighted and enraptured to be screened from the performance of his engagement, and to find his satrap assume the odium of the perfidy, of which his Irish subjects were the victims, wrote him, with his own hand, a letter of the most unqualified approbation:

"Wentworth,

"Before I answer any of your particular letters to me, I must tell you that your late public despatch has given me a great deal of contentment; and especially for the keeping off the envy of a necessary negative from me of those unreasonable graces that people expected of me."[154]

Perfidious as was this conduct, I do not pretend that Charles deserved thereby the fate that then impended over him. But this I dare aver, and do not fear much contradiction, that it must materially diminish the commiseration that upright men might feel for his downfal.

[154] Strafford, I. 331.

## CHAPTER VI.

*Security of person, during lord Clarendon's millenium. Martial law. Acts of state. Jurors punished with imprisonment and mutilation.*

"This tyrant, whose sole name blisters our tongues."[155]

WE have considered the question of religious liberty, during the forty years' millenium, the glories of which lord Clarendon has so elegantly recorded. We now proceed to consider that of personal security, on which ground, it is obvious, that to justify the noble writer, it would be indispensably necessary that the subject should be free from injury or molestation in his person, unless, by the infraction of some known law, he rendered himself amenable to its penal sanctions.

This was so far from being the case, that throughout this whole "blessed period of peace and security," martial law was uninterruptedly in force, and carried into execution whenever and wherever it suited the purposes of the government or its partisans.

Acts of state too, or, in other words, acts of the Privy Council, had all the force of the laws of

[155] Shakspeare.

the land; and were enforced by arrest, fine, and imprisonment.*

Jurors who refused to give verdicts agreeably to the wishes of the judges and the government, were cited before the Star-Chamber Court, and ruinously fined, and most grievously imprisoned.†

On the two first points, the characteristic infidelity of the historians of Irish affairs stands glaringly conspicuous. With such important features in the political economy of the government, we should be almost wholly unacquainted,

* *Extract from the Impeachment of lord Strafford.*

"Article 4. The said earl of Strafford said that he would make the earl [of Cork] and all Ireland know, so long as he had the government there, *any act of state, there made or to be made, should be as binding to the subjects of that kingdom, as an act of Parliament.*"[156]

"As for the words, he confessed them to be true; and thought he said no more than what became him; considering how much his master's honour was concerned in him; and that if a proportionable obedience was not *as well due to acts of state, as to acts of Parliament*, in vain did councils sit; and that he had done no more than what former deputies had done."[157]

"He proved by the lord Dillon, in the lord Chichester's and lord Grandison's time, that the acts of state were by the judges reputed as laws of the land for the present, and proceeded by *arrest*, *imprisonment*, and *fines*, upon contempt, which Sir Adam Loftus confirmed."[158]

† "Concerning the sentencing of jurors, and the questioning them in the Star-Chamber," said lord Strafford, on his trial, "it is true; *divers of these sentences were past.*"[159]

[156] Baker, 499.
[157] Frankland, 883.
[158] Nalson, II. 58.
[159] Idem, 45.

but for the trial of lord Strafford, which threw a glare of light on these, as well as many other of the heavy grievances of the country, that were by the historians passed in silence, or glossed over with frothy extenuations and mitigations.

Lord Strafford, during the whole of his administration, proceeded on the iniquitous principle, "that Ireland was a conquered country, and that the king was the lawgiver, in all matters not determined by acts of Parliament."* This principle he openly avowed on his trial, when his life was in jeopardy, for this and other causes: and this fully accounts for the despotic authority he assumed,—for his outrageous proceedings with Parliament,—for his attempted depredation on the province of Connaught, which shall be detailed in a future chapter; and for all the endless variety of injustice and oppression, which marked his despotic career, as lord deputy of Ireland.

One awful feature of his administration, which he likewise admitted on his trial, and for which

* Article 3, of the Impeachment.

"He did declare and publish, that *Ireland was a conquered nation; and that the king might do with them what he pleased.*"[160]

"'True it is,' he said, 'Ireland was a conquered nation; which no man can deny: and that *the king is the lawgiver, in matters not determined by acts of Parliament*, he conceived all loyal subjects would grant.'"[161]

[160] Baker, 499. [161] Frankland, 883.

he pleaded precedent as a justification, was sending parties of soldiers to execute orders of state, or decrees of courts.* It is easy to conceive the oppression that would be committed by such *officers of justice*, let loose on the objects of his vengeance. On the extent of this grievance, which existed during the whole of lord Clarendon's *millenium*, the evidence of Sir Arthur Tyringham, who was cited in Strafford's defence,

* "Article 15. That the said earl did, by his own authority, without any warrant or colour of law, tax and impose great sums of money upon the towns of Baltimore, Bandonbridge, Tallagh, and divers other towns or places, in the said realm of Ireland; and *did cause the same to be levied upon the inhabitants of those towns by troops of soldiers, with force and arms*, in a warlike manner: and, on the ninth of March, in the twelfth year of his now majesty's reign, traitorously did give authority unto Robert Saville, a sergeant-at-arms, and to the captains of companies of soldiers in several parts of the realm, *to lie on the lands and houses of such as would not conform to his orders*, until they should render obedience to his said orders and warrants; and after such submission, and not before, the said soldiers to return to their garrisons; and did also issue the like warrants unto divers others, which warrants were in warlike manner put in execution accordingly: and by such warlike means he did force divers of his majesty's subjects of that realm to submit themselves to his unlawful commands."[162]

To this article the earl replied, "that to this day nothing hath been more usual in Ireland, than for the governors to appoint soldiers to put all manner of sentences in execution; which he proved plainly to have been done frequently, and *familiarly exercised in Grandison's, Faulkland's, Chichester's, Wilmot's, Cork's, and all preceding deputies' times*."[163]

[162] Baker, 502. [163] Idem, 511.

throws great light. He deposed, that "In Faulkland's time, he knew *twenty soldiers assessed upon one man, for refusing to pay sixteen shillings sterling*."[164]

This single fact contains an entire volume on this subject. What an awful condemnation it carries to the authority of lord Clarendon! How does his "*blessed state of peace and security*" vanish into thin air, when brought to the test of the talisman of truth! And let it be observed, that this was an illustration, by a single example, of the wretched state of the entire nation, experienced "as well in time of peace as war."

Lord Strafford, when answering to the article of his indictment on the subject of martial law, replied, "It has been always in force, and executed in all times in Ireland, and never so sparingly as in my time.*

"I dare appeal to those that know the country, whether in former times many men have not been committed and executed by the deputies' warrants, that were not thieves and rebels, but

* "The earl answered, that the lord deputies have *ever exercised martial law, upon the march of the armies, as well in time of peace as war*."[165]

"The earl of Ely was sworn, and testified that martial law was in use in the kingdom of Ireland."[166]

"The deputies and generals of the army have always executed martial law, which is necessary there."[167]

[164] Baker, 511. [165] Nalson, II. 60.
[166] Ibid. [167] Idem, 21.

such as went up and down the country. *If they could not give a good account of themselves*, the provost marshal, by direction of the deputies, using in such cases to hang them up. I dare say, *there are hundreds of examples in this kind.*"[168]

In support of these allegations, he caused lord Dillon to be cited, who affirmed, that "martial law had been practised, and *men hanged by it, in times of peace.*"[169]

It must be obvious, even to a cursory observer, that when individuals had the power of executing martial law on persons "*who could not give a good account of themselves*," many men, obnoxious to the ruling powers, would, merely on that ground, be regarded as persons "who could not give a good account of themselves:" and, inferring from known principles of human nature,—from the eternal tendency in the possessors of uncontrolled power to abuse it,—from the rancorous and malignant spirit that existed towards the Roman Catholics,—and, at least in an equal degree, from the impunity their oppressors experienced, it is by no means improbable, that of the "*hundreds of persons*" who were thus hanged, as "*not able to give a good account of themselves*," there were many incomparably superior in worth and standing to the military executioners, by whose sentence they were hurried to their last account, with "all their sins and imperfections on their heads."

[168] Nalson, II. 115.

[169] Idem, 60.

How little value must have been set upon human life,—how deplorable the waste of the species,—what scenes of carnage and desolation must have taken place, when, in a time of peace, those "*who could not give a good account of themselves*" were liable to be tried, and were frequently tried, by courts martial, and hanged! Who was to decide on the *goodness of the account?* Probably, in most cases, a merciless wretch, who united in his person the three characters of judge, jury, and executioner! What a millenium! What a "blessed condition of peace and security!"

The imprisonment of juries whose verdicts displeased the courts or the deputies, was another grievous oppression, and an instrument whereby the streams of justice were wholly perverted or poisoned. It is obvious that the fear of tedious imprisonment and of ruinous fines, must have a pernicious effect on juries, and frequently influence them to give unjust verdicts, in order to rescue themselves from danger. No man's life, character, or estate can be secure, if subject to the decision of a jury, when fines and imprisonment dance before their mind's eye, as a reward for incurring the displeasure of the judges or the administration.

We have the evidence of lord Strafford himself, strong and decisive, on the subject of the imprisonment of jurors, in the outrageous case of the grand jury of Galway, who were fined four thousand pounds each, and imprisoned till

their fines were paid, for a verdict, the circumstances of which require a particular discussion. This single case, as a fair specimen of the despotic power exercised over juries generally, would be sufficient to explode lord Clarendon's picture of the *forty years' golden age*, so far as respects personal security.

But fines and imprisonment were not the only bars to a belief in lord Clarendon's "blessed state of peace and security." The train was brought up by the pillory and mutilation of members, under the arbitrary sentences of the Star-Chamber and the High Commission Courts.

The second of the articles of impeachment preferred by the Irish House of Commons against Richard Bolton, lord chancellor of Ireland, John, lord bishop of Derry, Sir Gerard Lowther, and Sir George Ratcliffe, states that they "have perpetrated, practised, and done many traitorous and unlawful acts and things, whereby as well divers mutinies and rebellions have been raised; as also many thousands of his majesty's liege people of this kingdom have been ruined in their goods, lands, liberties, and lives; and many of them, being of good quality and reputation, have been utterly defamed, *by pillory, mutilation of members, and other infamous punishments*."[170]

In the accusation, moreover, of the earl of Strafford, preferred by the same House of Com-

[170] Rushworth, IV. 219.

mons, it is stated, that "persons who gave verdicts according to their consciences, were censured in the Castle-Chamber, in great fines; *sometimes pilloried, with loss of ears;* sometimes *bored through the tongue;* and sometimes *marked in the forehead with an iron; and other infamous punishments.*"[171]

To complete the picture, and to evince more fully the grinding and odious tyranny of this bashaw, I shall lay before the reader two remarkable cases, which display as much lordly despotism, as much malice, and as much inhumanity, as are to be found united in any part of the history of the eastern sultans.

Strafford had seduced the daughter of lord Loftus, chancellor of Ireland, and member of the Privy Council. This was established by his letters, found in her drawers after her death. Her husband, Sir John Gifford, required from his father-in-law a greater fortune than he thought proper to bestow upon his strumpet daughter, the deputy's mistress. Gifford, by a paper petition, brought the affair before the Privy Council, which issued a decree in his favour. The chancellor, relying on its illegality, refused compliance; and, in punishment of his contumacy, was sequestered from his seat in the Privy Council, deprived of the seal as chancellor, and committed to prison. He appealed to Charles, for

[171] Journals, I.

redress against such flagitious oppression: but the despotic monarch, determined to support his despotic vicegerent, rejected the petition: and the chancellor was reduced to the humiliating necessity of deprecating the vengeance of the insolent satrap, by an acknowledgment of offence, and a request of pardon,[172] for injuries which, we might almost venture to assert, deserved the untimely end which awaited Strafford, from the vengeance of his enemies in the Long Parliament. Certain it is, that many men have lost their lives, for acts of violence inferior in atrocity to those of which the lords Loftus and Mountnorris were the victims.

The other case was that of lord Mountnorris. The story is related somewhat differently by different writers; but I shall adhere to the statement given by that lord himself, on the trial of the impeachment of lord Strafford.

Lord Mountnorris had been threatened with a stick by the deputy, at a review; and some time afterwards, a relation and namesake of his, who lived with lord Strafford, having accidentally hurt his foot, while he was labouring under a fit of the gout, the circumstance was mentioned in the hearing of lord Mountnorris; and it was said, that perhaps he did it to avenge the insult his kinsman had received. Mountnorris replied, that he had a brother who would not have taken such

[172] Leland, III. 45.

a mode of avenging his cause. These expressions, after a considerable lapse of time, were reported to lord Strafford, who, with a degree of malignity that has probably never been exceeded, tortured it into an attempt to excite mutiny, and had him tried by a court martial. The proceedings before the court were as wicked as the accusation was unjust.* Mountnorris was debarred

* Third article of Impeachment.

"Upon Saturday, March 27th, they proceeded to the sentencing lord Mountnorris, &c. and thereby exerting tyrannical power, &c. and first read the sentence, reciting the king's letter, commanding a council of war to sit upon the lord Mountnorris, a captain, &c. for inciting revenge against the lord deputy, general of his majesty's army.

"Lord Mountnorris deposed, That he was called to a council of war, charged to have spoken words to this purpose: That being told that a kinsman of his had hurt the lord deputy's gouty foot, he should say, Perhaps it was done in revenge of that public affront that the lord deputy did me formerly; but I have a brother that would not have taken such revenge. That he was required *instantly to confess or deny* the charge; that *he desired time to answer*, *but was denied*, *as also to produce witnesses*, to disprove the lord Moor and Sir Robert Loftus, who upon oath affirmed it; that thereupon, *in half an hour*, *sentence was pronounced against him* by Sir Charles Coote, provost marshal. That the lord deputy, in scorn, told him that he might proceed to execution, but would supplicate with his majesty for his life, and rather lose his hand than he should lose his head.

"That he was committed to prison December 12th, and bailed out the 18th, the physicians making oath, he was in danger of his life, *the high oppression and injustice having thrown him into a desperate sickness;* committed again 11th of April, let out May 2d, by reason of sickness; re-committed

the opportunity of producing witnesses to disprove the accusation,—and in half an hour was pronounced guilty, and sentenced to be cashiered and shot. He languished a long time in severe imprisonment, and was not finally released till he had made the most humble submission, and after an expenditure of twenty thousand pounds.

His lady wrote as affecting a letter* to the

the 30th January following, because he had not sued out his pardon, and there continued till March, 1637.[173]

* *The lady Mountnorris to the lord Strafford.*

" My lord,

" I beseech your lordship, for the tender mercy of God, take off your heavy hand from my dear lord; and for her sake who is with God, be pleased not to make me and my poor infants miserable, as we must of necessity be, by the hurt you do to him. God knows, my lord, that I am a poor distressed woman, and know not what to say, more than to beg upon my knees, with my homely prayers and tears, that it will please the Almighty to incline your lordship's heart to mildness towards him; for if your lordship continue my lord in restraint, and lay disgraces upon him, I have too much cause to fear that your lordship will put a speedy end to his life and troubles, and make me and all mine forever miserable. Good my lord, pardon these woful lines of a disconsolate creature, and be pleased, for Christ Jesus' sake, to take this my humble suit into your favourable consideration, and to have mercy upon me and mine; and God will, I hope, reward it into the bosom of you, and your sweet children by my kinswoman; and for the memory of her, I beseech your lordship to compassionate the distressed condition of me,

Your lordship's most humble and disconsolate servant,

JANE MOUNTNORRIS.

This 13th of February, 1635-6.

Endorsed, " A copy of the lady Mountnorris's letter to the

[173] Nalson, II. 39.

deputy as ever was penned, soliciting mercy for her husband; but he was inexorable. She likewise made the most urgent solicitations to Charles for his interference,* but equally in vain. He was

earl of Strafford, when her husband was in prison, under the sentence of death by martial law: and he was so hard-hearted as he gave her no relief."[174]

* *Copy of the lady Mountnorris's Petition to his Majesty, with his Majesty's answer.*

"To the king's most excellent majesty, the humble petition of the lady Mountnorris.

"Most gracious sovereign,

"Having, by several petitions, humbly presented the sorrows of her heart and soul to your sacred majesty, in the behalf of her condemned husband, who hath suffered in honour, health, and imprisonment, for a word misinterpreted, and already unto twenty thousand pounds lost in estate, unparalleled precedents for a peer of that realm; and still pursued in the castle chamber, in Ireland, where he can expect but sad events, if your majesty's impartial justice redeem him not. He hath been a careful and faithful servant in chief place to your majesty's blessed father, for forty years; and if he hath erred through human defects, he most humbly craveth pardon, and layeth himself at your majesty's feet, to do with him whatsoever your majesty shall command. Her humble suit, on her knees, is no more, but that your sacred majesty will command his coming into England, being now useless here, his places taken from him, his health impaired, and his estate ruined; and she and *her twelve children* shall, as in duty bound, pray for your majesty's long and happy reign over us."

"At the Court at Windsor, 18th July, 1636.

"His majesty is pleased, that, upon such a submission made by the lord Mountnorris, as the lord deputy of Ireland shall approve of, he shall have his liberty to come into England; whereof the lord deputy is to take notice, and give order herein accordingly.

FRAN. WINDEBANK."[175]

[174] Clarendon's S. P. I. 449. [175] Idem, 594.

determined not to impair the despotic authority of his representative, by interposing the royal clemency between him and any of the objects of his malice or vengeance.

A few revolving years presented to the lips of the obdurate favourite, and his equally obdurate monarch, the bitter chalice of heartless persecution, which they had held forth to those of the heart-broken mourner. The conduct of Charles, on this occasion, is among the clearest proofs he ever afforded of an unrelenting disposition. Never was there a stronger claim to the exercise of clemency; and never did the lordly insolence of an overbearing satrap more fully require a humiliating degradation. The most zealous advocates of the unfortunate monarch cannot deny that this is an indelible blot on his escutcheon.

When such elevated characters met such a fate, we may well conceive how dreadful must have been the situation of the nation at large, how grinding the tyranny under which they groaned, and how unfounded lord Clarendon's dreams of a "*blessed state of peace and security.*"

It may be objected, that, as these noblemen were not Roman Catholics, their cases do not apply. This objection is of no avail. It rather strengthens than enfeebles my argument. Tyranny ran riot with far more impunity over the Roman Catholics than over the Protestants. The oppression of six of the former would not excite so much clamour as that of one of the latter.

## CHAPTER VII.

*Further review of Clarendon's millenium. Plots and conspiracies. Droppers of letters. Wholesale spoliations in Ulster. Law, conscience, and honour of James I. Sir John Davies. Frontless fraud and chicane.*

WE have examined the correctness of lord Clarendon's fascinating portrait of the Irish millenium, that "blessed condition of peace and security," which continued "during the whole happy reign of king James," and was "increased and improved under his late majesty," so far as respects the holy, the sacred right of adoring the Living God as conscience dictates; and also as respects the security of person. It now comes before us on the question of security of the rights of property, the universal stimulus to the exercise of all the talents and endowments bestowed upon us by our Creator.

The noble author informs us, that "whatsoever their land, labour, or industry produced, was their own, being free from having it taken from them by the king, on any pretence whatsoever."

Of this specious tale, it is sufficient to say, that it is just as fair and as correct a portrait as the

religious one which we have reviewed. Clarendon's regard to truth ran *pari passu* in both cases. I hope to make it appear, that, during the whole period embraced in his millenium, there was hardly a man in the kingdom whose property was secure. Under the most frivolous pretexts, the nobility and gentry were plundered of estates which had remained in their families for ages; and such scenes of rapine and depredation were exhibited, as never were exceeded in any country in the world, in a time of peace.

These depredations were of two kinds: by the government, on a large scale, but confined to particular situations; and by fraudulent and rapacious individuals, on a small scale, but extended all over the country.

To present the subject more clearly and distinctly to the reader, I shall consider each branch separately; and, although the government, throughout the reigns of James I. and Charles I. maintained an almost unceasing predatory warfare on individual property, yet in this review, I shall confine myself to the three great cases:—

I. The lawless spoliation in Ulster, where six counties were at once seized by king James;

II. The seizure of a large portion of King's and Queen's counties, Longford, Leitrim, and Westmeath;

III. The projected seizure of the entire province of Connaught by Strafford, the final accom-

plishment of which was prevented solely by the civil wars in Scotland and England.

### I. *The Spoliation of Ulster.*

The unceasing rapine perpetrated on the Irish, for four hundred years, from the invasion by Henry II. till the reign of James I. was speciously covered with the mantle of rebellion, which was always within reach. The deputies of the kings of England, or the deputies of those deputies, or even the provost marshals, could, at any time, to suit their purposes, excite a rebellion, or what, in the castle style, was denominated a rebellion. Every act of resistance of insult, outrage, or aggression, was thus designated in proclamations, and afterwards in histories. The prescription was simple. It had been administered times without number, and never failed of success. It was only to make an inroad, or to commit some depredation on such of the Irish nobility or gentry as might be selected for the purpose, the more flagrant the better; provoke them to resistance, as I have already stated; then proclaim them traitors, and let the armies loose to destroy them.

The pedantic James changed the system; and substituted the fraud of the fox for the violence of the lion. He accomplished the same end, without the expense of raising a soldier, or firing a gun; and acquired, without disbursing a shilling, six entire counties in one province, and

nearly five in another. Pretended plots and conspiracies were easily fabricated; they were unexpensive; and succeeded to admiration, so as to render unnecessary the apparatus of a rebellion, which would have obliged the "*peace-loving*" James to open the doors of the temple of Janus, to which he had an unconquerable aversion.

A catch-penny letter was dropped in the castle, containing an absurd and contemptible development of a plot, of which the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel were asserted to be the principal agents.* It was pretended to be from a Catholic,

* The import of the letter was as follows: "That he was called into company by some Popish gentlemen, who, after administering an oath of secrecy, declared their purpose to murder or poison the deputy, to cut off Sir Oliver Lambert, to pick up one by one the rest of the officers of state, to oblige the small dispersed garrisons by hunger to submit, or to pen them up as sheep to their shambles. That the castle of Dublin, being neither manned nor victualled, they held as their own; that the towns were for them, the country with them, the great ones abroad and in the North prepared to answer the first alarm; that the powerful men in the West are assured by their agents to be ready as soon as the state is in disorder. That the Catholic king had promised, and the Jesuits from the Pope had warranted, men and means to second the first stirs, and royally to protect all their actions. That as soon as the state is dissolved, and the king's sword in their hands, they will elect a governor, chancellor and council, despatch letters to king James I. trusting to his unwillingness to embark in such a war, and to his facility to pardon, would grant their own conditions of peace and government, with toleration of religion: that if the king listen not to their motions, then that the many days spent in England in debates and preparations would give them time enough to breathe, fortify, and

who had been tampered with by the traitors, and whom they had endeavoured to seduce into the conspiracy, but whose loyalty rendered him incorruptible. The conspirators, it was stated in the letter, had determined on poisoning the deputy, cutting off Sir Oliver Lambert, picking up, one by one, the rest of the officers, starving the garrisons,* &c. &c. It is almost as stupid and clumsy a performance as the depositions respecting the apparitions at Portnedown bridge, or those about the invulnerable woman, which may be seen in page 41. It carries the strongest marks of fabrication on its face.

furnish the maritime coasts; and at leisure call to their aid the Spanish forces from all parts." The writer of the letter declares, "That he interposed some doubts on them, which they readily answered; and he pretended to them to consent to further their projects, and that he took the method of this letter, to give notice of their designs, though he refused to betray his friends; in the mean time he would use his best endeavours to hinder any further practices." And he concludes, "That if they did not desist, though he reverenced the Mass and Catholic religion equal to any of them, yet he would make the leaders of that dance know, that he preferred his country's good, before their busy and ambitious humours."[176]

* "*A letter dropt in the Privy Council Chamber*, intimated a traitorous scheme of rebellion formed by the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, and other Irish lords and gentlemen of the north; that they had solicited assistance from Spain and Brussels, and intended to begin the war with surprising the castle of Dublin, and assassinating the lord deputy and council."[177]

[176] Plowden, I. App. 48. [177] Leland, II. 498.

This trick of fabricating plots, and dropping letters to betray them, had been long in use, and was continued through the entire century.* It

* This trick was successfully carried into operation, during the administration of the marquis of Ormond, after the restoration, and excited such an alarm in the public mind, and such a terror and abhorrence of the Roman Catholics, that they were completely defeated in their attempts to procure redress of their grievances, or restoration of the property of which they had been despoiled. For this express purpose it was devised.†

† "The Papists (under his government) were in no apprehensions of extirpation or other violent measures, the dread of which had hurried them into the late rebellion. This moderation of the lord lieutenant *was not agreeable to some persons*, who possibly imagining that he might be driven out of it by the danger of assassination, *dropped letters in the streets of Dublin*, intimating a conspiracy formed for murdering his grace; and several pretended to give an account of what they had heard or suspected of such a design."[178]

"*A letter addressed by an unknown person* to lord Mount Alexander, in the county of Down, *warned him of a general massacre intended by the Irish.* The style was mean and vulgar; nor was the information on that account less plausible. It was confident and circumstantial; and pointed out Sunday, the ninth day of December, *as the precise time when this bloody design was to be executed, without distinction of sex, age, or condition.* The like intelligence was conveyed to some other gentlemen of the northern province: and whether these letters were the contrivance of artifice, or the effect of credulity, *their influence was wonderful.*"[179]

[178] Carte, II. 481. [179] Leland, IV. 229.

forms an important feature in the history of the oppressions of the Irish, as it was a potent and infallible instrument to crush and destroy them. It therefore requires a particular discussion, which it is my intention to bestow on it, in a future part of this work.

Let it suffice, so far as respects the present question, that means were used to terrify the earls, who, in consequence, fled the kingdom.

In this flight there is something mysterious, which, at this distance of time and place, and in the wretched state of Irish history, it is impossible to develop. The earls might have been guilty, and have fled through consciousness of their crimes: but it is to the last degree unlikely; for, as Leland observes, "It seems extraordinary, that the northerns, who were still smarting under the chastisement they had received in the late rebellion, whose consequence and influence were considerably diminished, and who were very lately reconciled to government, should precipitately involve themselves in the guilt of a new rebellion."[180] And it will not be denied, that, if they were guilty, there would have been some evidence to substantiate their guilt, which never was produced: for it is hardly within possibility, that a plot of so great magnitude as was pretended, should have existed, without affording such evidence. James I. finding the clamour that was

[180] Leland, II. 498.

excited in Europe, by the merciless spoliations and depredations practised in Ulster, issued a proclamation, in which he lavished the most scurrilous abuse on the earls, utterly destitute of truth. He charged them, among other things, with regarding "*murder as no fault, marriage of no use, nor any man worthy to be esteemed valiant, that did not glory in rapine or oppression.*"[181] This tirade is as excessively gross and unseemly, as it is wholly destitute of truth, and is a disgrace to the memory of the royal pedant. There never was a period in Ireland, that could justify this Billingsgate attack.

Dr. Leland, assuming that the earls published no vindication of themselves, seems disposed to infer from thence, that their silence arose from the consciousness of their guilt, which made them acquiesce in the justice of their fate. But there is no satisfactory proof of this silence: for the non-appearance of such a vindication, above an hundred and thirty years afterwards, in the time of Leland, is by no means to be admitted as a proof, or even a presumption, that it was not published; and far less will it warrant the inference that the doctor is willing to draw from it. Rapin states, that they "*gave out* that the outrages committed on the Catholics had induced them to leave their country."[182] He does not state in what form they "*gave out*" this defence:

[181] Leland, II. 500

[182] Rapin, VIII. 69.

whether orally or in a written vindication. The latter, however, is the more probable course. But we have no proof that this was the reason they "*gave out*" for their flight: it rests on the single declaration of Rapin; and the various instances we have seen of the characteristic infidelity and illiberality of the historians of Irish affairs, in plain and simple points, impose on us an imperious duty to receive their accounts with great circumspection, in cases involved in difficulty or uncertainty.

On this question, the reasoning of Dr. Curry is so strong and conclusive, that there needs no apology for laying it before the reader:

"The king himself was so apprehensive that this affair of the earls 'might blemish' (as he expresses it, in a proclamation on that occasion) 'the reputation of that friendship which ought to be mutually observed between him and other princes, that he thought it not amiss to publish some such matter, by way of proclamation, as might better clear men's judgments concerning the same.' At the same time solemnly promising 'that *it should appear to the world as clear as the sun, by evident proof*, that the only ground of these earls' departure, was the private knowledge and inward terror of their own guiltiness.' But neither in that proclamation, nor in any other authentic instrument, nor in any manner whatever, did his majesty deign, ever after, to enlighten the world, even with *the least glimpse of evident proof*, that such was the only motive of these earls' departure.' And I shall leave it to the decision of every candid reader, whether the non-performance of his majesty's solemn promise be not a better negative proof of the nullity and fiction of this conspiracy of the earls, than the bare non-appearance of a memorial in their vindication can be deemed of its reality."[183]

[183] Curry, I. 86.

An account of the discovery of the conspiracy, entirely different from the foregoing, has been published: for the trick of the letter was found to be too gross, and had been worn threadbare. It is stated by Carleton, bishop of Chichester, that the earl of Tyrone having possessed himself of some lands belonging to the bishop of Meath, the latter applied to O'Cahan, one of the conspirators, for information on the subject of those lands, which he promised to furnish. The bishop accordingly brought him to Dublin, to give testimony on the subject. Process was issued against the earl, ordering him to appear in that city, to answer the bishop of Derry's claim,* but without

* "Tyrone, understanding the bishop sought to recover the lands of the bishopric, told the bishop thus much, 'My lord, you have two or three bishoprics, and yet you are not content with them: you seek the lands of my earldom.' 'My lord,' quoth the bishop, 'your earldom is swoln so big with the lands of the church, that it will burst, if it be not vented.'

"The bishop, intending in a lawful course to recover the lands lost, found that there was no man could give him better light and knowledge of those things than O'Cane, who had been great with Tyrone; and to make use of him was a matter of difficulty: yet some means being used to him, he came of his own accord to the bishop, and told him that he could help him to the knowledge of that which he sought: but he was afraid of Tyrone. 'Nay,' said the bishop, 'I will not trust you; for I know that one bottle of aqua vitæ will draw you from me to Tyrone.'

"Whereupon he took a book, and laid it on his head, saying, '*Ter luiro, ter luiro*,' which, my lord of Meath said, (who told me this story) is one of the greatest kind of affirming a truth which the Irish have: and after this ceremony performed, they keep their promise.

reference to any conspiracy, or *dropped letter*. "There was no other intention then but in a peaceable way to bring the suit to a trial:" for, let it be well weighed, THE COUNCIL THEN KNEW NOTHING OF THE CONSPIRACY.[184]

These accounts are in direct opposition to each other, and prove the rottenness of the affair. Dr. Carleton's narrative is a wretched, improbable tale: but if it were true, then the story of the *dropped letter* is obviously a falsehood: and if the letter were really dropped, and led to the discovery of the conspiracy, then is the

"O'Cane, using this ceremony, promised to reveal all that he knew in that matter, if he would, on the other side, promise him to save him from the violence of Tyrone, and not to deliver him into England, which he promised to do.

"Whereupon the bishop resolved *to bring him to the council of Ireland*, there to take his confession. Thus they coming peaceably to the council, the confession of O'Cane was taken. After this, *process were sent to Tyrone, to warn him to come, at an appointed time, to answer to the suit of the lord bishop of Derry*. There was no other intention then but *in a peaceable manner to bring the suit to a trial.* But behold the burden of an evil conscience! Tyrone had entered into a new conspiracy, to raise another rebellion: of this conspiracy was O'Cane. *This thing was secret:* THE COUNCIL KNEW NOTHING OF IT. Tyrone, *being served with process to answer the suit, began to suspect that this was but a plot to draw him in;* that surely all the treason was revealed by O'Cane, whom he knew to be of the conspiracy; that the pretence was a process and a trial in law, but THE INTENT WAS TO HAVE HIS HEAD. Upon this bare suspicion, Tyrone resolved, with such other as was in the conspiracy, to fly; and thereupon fled out of Ireland, with his confederates, and left all those lands in the north of Ireland."[185]

[184] Carleton, 233.

[185] Idem, 232.

bishop's account false. We leave the reader to settle the question of fraud between them; and venture to submit what appears a much more rational view of the affair than is given by either of the statements.

The greedy courtiers, who finally obtained possession of the immense estates of the earls, were hungering after them, and anxious to find some pretext for a seizure. They had recourse to the clumsy contrivance of the letter, the contents of which were probably magnified and exaggerated to the most extravagant degree, accompanied with rumours and threats of a rigorous course to be pursued with them, if they came to Dublin; at the same time issuing process for Tyrone to appear there. Thus he and those implicated with him in the *dropped-letter*-contrivance, were placed in the dilemma, to attend, and probably be attainted, or to refuse, and be proclaimed rebels and traitors, and pursued with fire and sword, as was the usual mode of proceeding in such cases. In these trying circumstances, they fled for safety to the continent. But so far as respects the present object, the disproof of Clarendon's millenium, it is of little importance what construction the reader puts on this statement. It is barely submitted, without any concern whether it be admitted or rejected, as beyond comparison more probable than the letter-dropping affair, or the idle story of a Catholic conspirator betraying his dearest friend

and conspiring accomplice, and running voluntarily into danger of his neck and estate, to make discoveries of property belonging to, and for the benefit of, an entire stranger, and a Protestant!

The case of an earl of Tyrone, perhaps the same person, under queen Elizabeth, affords a specimen of the wretched flimsiness of the pretexts made use of to involve the Irish nobility in the charge of treasonable conspiracies.

"The lord deputy and council (says Sir James Ware) certified her majesty of the *daily seditious practices of the earl*, which they looked upon to be *forerunners of rebellion:* how he sent to Mac Connel, who was a chief among the Island Scots, many of his men, upon condition to receive supplies from him upon any occasion whatsoever he required; how he claimed the chief men of Ulster to depend on him as his vassals; how *he had sent his son to be fostered among the O'Cahans*, to whom he had formerly been a great enemy; which *showed a great combination to make way for his future greatness;* fostering being accounted the greatest bond of amity among the Irish. They concluded with an earnest request, that some treasure might be sent over to supply the soldiers' wants."[186]

"Though Tyrone had served against Macguire, and received a wound in the service, yet his refusal to deliver the sons of Shane O'Neal, after their escape out of the castle of Dublin, when required so to do, together with *his frequent complaints against the lord deputy*, the marshals, and the garrison soldiers, gave sufficient ground to believe that *he only covered his treacherous intentions*, till he might be ready to put them in execution."[187] Excellent proofs, most assuredly!

The case of Shane O'Neal, the chief potentate of Ulster, during the same reign, is still more in

[186] Ware, Eliz. 40. [187] Idem, 47.

point. His conspiracy was not discovered by "*a dropped letter*," but revealed to a servant, at a drinking bout. The story is narrated with great naivete, by Sir James:

"At this time, the lord lieutenant received some intimation that Shane O'Neal was *contriving new conspiracies*."[188]

How do you suppose, gentle reader, he received this intimation, and what were the contents of it? Attend:

"A kinsman of his, [Shane O'Neal's] drinking in company with the collector of the archbishop of Armagh's revenues at Drogheda, was heard to swear by his soul, that *his cousin was a patient fool*, and so were his ancestors, in taking an earldom from the kings of England, when, by right, themselves were kings. He further added, by way of question, to the bishop's servant, Is it not so? The man was glad to comply, and to say it was so, seeing six of the Irish in the room, with their skeans by them. But as soon as he came to his master, Adam Loftus, he cried out, *Pardon me, master.* The archbishop asking him, Why, what hast thou done? He told him the whole story. Whereupon *he wrote to the lord lieutenant about it.*"[189]

Certainly this was a most important communication to the lord lieutenant, on which the safety of the state depended, and precisely on a level with the *dropped letter*, which cost one hundred and fifty thousand people five hundred thousand acres of land. Never, before or since, has any letter, whether *dropped* or sent through the post-office, afforded such a harvest.

In consequence of this "conspiracy," so very dangerous in itself, so miraculously discovered.

188 Ware, Eliz. 7.

189 Ibid.

and so accurately and minutely detailed, troops were raised against the rebel, many of his followers killed, and "*great preys of cattle made.*"'[190] And be it observed, that throughout the whole of the history of Ireland, "*preys of cattle*" form a most important item in the spoils of war gained by the lords deputies.

Some time afterwards,

> "On the complaint of the nobility, the lord deputy raised a great army of English and Irish, in order to root out Shane O'Neal."[191]

Here, the reader will observe, there was no "*dropped letter*," no "conspiracy," no "rebellion;" but the first family in Ireland, with all its numerous branches and dependencies, to the amount, perhaps, of thousands, was to be "*rooted out*," on the complaint of "*the nobility!*" and two or three hundred thousand acres of land forfeited, "for the promotion of religion and civilization." But it was all fair. It was only "*spoiling the Egyptians*," those wretches that neither "built houses nor planted orchards."

Those who carefully examine the sorry romances above quoted, will find it difficult to decide which is most wonderful, the stupidity with which they are contrived, or the wickedness which employed such means to despoil an oppressed and unoffending people.

But however the question of the guilt or innocence of the earls may be determined, it does not

[190] Ware, Eliz. 7. [191] Idem, 10.

affect the character of the proceedings of king James, after "*their fugacy*," as it is quaintly termed by Sir Thomas Philips. Those proceedings displayed such a flagitious spirit of depredation, such a total disregard of private right and the calls of humanity, such a wanton waste of human happiness, and such base hypocrisy, in cloaking it with a regard for the civilization and the eternal happiness of the natives, as cannot be exceeded in the history of human injustice.

For admitting the guilt of the earls to have been fully and completely established, they and their accomplices alone ought to have suffered for it. It was a violation of every principle of honour and justice, to involve the innocent with the guilty,—to proscribe indiscriminately the entire population of six out of the thirty-two counties contained in the kingdom. This was the course pursued in the plantation of Ulster, of which such erroneous statements have been made, in all the histories that embrace the reign of James I. with hardly an exception.

By the "*fugacy*" of the earls, every man in the six counties was regarded as having at once, ipso facto, forfeited his lands, which became vested in the crown, to be granted, at the pleasure of the monarch, to whomsoever, and on whatsoever terms, he judged proper.

There were three divisions made of the spoils:

First, to "English and Scotch, who are to plant their proportions with English and Scottish tenants;"

Secondly, to "servitors in Ireland, who may take English or Irish tenants, at their choice;"

Thirdly, to "natives of those counties, who are to be freeholders."[192]

The largest and fairest portion of the lands was bestowed on the favoured few of the first class;[A] to the next were bestowed those of the second quality; and the despoiled Irish were planted on the inferior quality.

But a malignant feature of this transaction remains behind,—a feature unique in its character. The wretched Irish, deprived of their paternal homes, driven out to the most sterile spots, were barbarously cut off from all chance of ever regaining their possessions; as the undertakers and servitors were bound, under penalty, never to sell to the "mere Irish,"[B] nor to Roman Catholics

[A] *Orders and Conditions of the Plantation of Ulster.*

"8. That in the surveys, observations be made what proportions, by name, are fittest to be allotted to the Britains, what to the servitors, and what to the natives; wherein this respect is to be had, that *the Britains be put in places of best safety;* the natives to be dispersed; and *the servitors planted in those places which are of greatest importance to serve the rest.*"[193]

[B] *Articles concerning the undertakers.*

"7. The said undertakers, their heirs and assigns, shall not alien or demise their portions, or any part thereof, *to the mere Irish*, or to such persons as will not take the oath, which the said undertakers are bound to take by the former article: and to that end, a proviso shall be inserted in their letters patents.

[192] Hibernica, 106. [193] Idem, 126.

of any nation: for the disposal to persons who did not take the oath of supremacy, and "*conform themselves in religion according to his majesty's laws*,"[194] was rigorously prohibited and punished.

Now, reader, are you not petrified with astonishment, at this view of the grand and magnificent scheme, which has immortalized the memory of the first Stuart that wielded the triple sceptre of the British dominions?

To bring this point home to the feelings of an American reader, I venture to state an analogous case, to which I request particular attention. Suppose that the resistance of America, in 1776, had terminated as fatally as the various insurrections of Ireland have done; or, to come nearer

"10. The said undertakers shall not alien their portions during five years next after the date of their letters patents, but in this manner, viz. one third part in fee farm; another third part for forty years or under; reserving to themselves the other third part, without alienation, during the said five years. But *after the said five years, they shall be at liberty to alien to all persons* EXCEPT THE MERE IRISH, and such persons as will not take the oath which the said undertakers are to take as aforesaid."[195]

*Article concerning the servitors.*

"9. They [the servitors] shall not alien their portions, or any part thereof, *to the mere Irish*, or to any such person or persons as will not take the like oath, as the said undertakers were to take as aforesaid; and to that end a proviso shall be inserted in their letters patents."[196]

[194] Hibernica, 126. [195] Idem, 127. [196] Idem, 128.

to the true state of the case, to make the analogy more complete, suppose a wild, incoherent letter had, in 1774, been dropped in the court of St. James's, accusing George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Peyton Randolph, of a conspiracy; suppose that such threats were held out, and such underhand means used, as to induce them to have recourse to "*fugacy:*" suppose that, in consequence of their flight, George III. imitating the pious example of James I. had seized on the entire province of Virginia; had taken the inhabitants, like so many merino sheep, and planted, in the Dismal Swamp, North Carolina, those whose ancestors, for time immemorial, had had lordly palaces in the great Limestone valley: and suppose further, that those "*merino sheep,*" planted in the Dismal Swamp, were condemned to vegetate there, and that the intruders on their possessions in the valley were bound, under heavy penalties, never to sell to them: suppose, too, that a large portion of the ill-fated inhabitants, who could not be placed advantageously in the Dismal Swamp, were "transported into such other parts,[A] as, by

[A] "The sword-men are to be transported into such other parts of the kingdom, as, *by reason of the waste land therein*, are fittest to receive them: namely, into Connaught and some parts of Munster; where *they are to be dispersed*, and not planted together in one place: and such sword-men as have not followers, nor cattle of their own, *to be disposed of in his majesty's service.*"[197]

[197] Hibernica, 109.

reason of the waste land therein, were fittest to receive them, and not planted together in one place." What judgment would he form of such a system of rapine and cruelty? Would he not regard it as an odious violation of the most holy and sacred rights of human nature? Such a judgment ought he to form of the "*famous northern plantation, so honourable to the king*."[198]

The reader is shocked with this detail. He wishes it drawn to a close. He supposes he has learned all its odious features, and that it is impossible to add a shade to its deformity. But he is quite mistaken: one of the vilest remains to be stated. The wretched natives, thus plundered, thus defrauded of their patrimonial inheritance, were still further plundered, and defrauded of a large portion of the shabby "equivalent," as it was called. In some cases, they did not receive above a half or a third, and in some no part whatever, of what was intended for them by the upright monarch by whom this spoliation had been perpetrated.

"The commissioners appointed to distribute the lands, scandalously abused their trusts: and, by fraud or violence, deprived the natives of those possessions which the king had reserved for them. *Some indeed were allowed to enjoy a small pittance of such reservation.* OTHERS WERE TOTALLY EJECTED."[199]

"The interested assiduity of the king's creatures, *in scrutinizing the titles to those lands which had not been found or acknowledged to belong to the crown, was, if possible*, STILL MORE DETESTABLE."[200]

198 Leland, II. 504. 199 Idem, 546. 200 Idem, 547.

"There are not wanting proofs *of the most iniquitous practices, of hardened cruelty, of vile perjury, and scandalous subornation, employed to despoil the fair and unoffending proprietor of his inheritance.*"[201]

"In several ancient grants, there had been a reservation of rents to the crown. During long intervals of commotion, the king's revenue had not been, nor could be, regularly collected; nor had such rents been put in charge, by his officers, for ages. *Acquittances were now demanded.* IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO PRODUCE THEM: and the failure to produce them was pleaded as SUFFICIENT TO OVERTHROW THE FAIREST TITLES."[202]

After a careful perusal of the foregoing view of the indefensible means by which James possessed himself of so fair a portion of Ireland, and the wanton injustice whereby the settlement was regulated, what must be the astonishment, how great the indignation, of the candid and upright, to read the deceptious and encomiastic manner in which the affair is blazoned forth by all the historians who have treated on it! Had James civilized a nation of fierce barbarians, without offering the least violence to their persons, the least injustice to their property,—had he framed for them a code of laws equal to what might be produced by the united wisdom of Moses, Lycurgus, Solon, Minos, Numa Pompilius, and Alfred, —had he settled them on lands of his own, and bestowed abundant means of cultivating them, he could not be entitled to higher encomiums than are lavished on acts which, so far as the rights of property are concerned, have far more

[201] Leland, II. 549. [202] Idem, 548.

of the character of Attila or Barbarossa, than of Alfred or William Penn, and which deserve the severest strains of indignant reprobation.*

"To consider James in a more advantageous light," says Hume, "we must take a view of him as *the legislator of Ireland:* and most of the institutions which he had formed for civilizing that kingdom, being finished about this period, it may not here be improper to give some account of them. He frequently boasts of the management of Ireland as his masterpiece; and it will appear, upon inquiry, that *his vanity in this particular was not altogether unfounded.*[203]

"After abolishing these Irish customs, and substituting English law in their place, James, *having taken all the natives under his protection*, and declared them free citizens, proceeded to govern them by a regular administration, military as well as civil."[204]

Here is a portrait, as like the real state of the case, as the reign of Nero was like that of Marcus Aurelius. After having despoiled an

* "He who could not establish the right of his possessions, clearly and indisputably, lay at the mercy of the crown, and had no way but to *compound on the best terms he could obtain*, and to get a new grant of his estate."[205]

"Where no grant appeared, or no descent or conveyance in pursuance of it could be proved, *the land was immediately adjudged to belong to the crown.*"[206]

"The lands of all absentees, and of all that had been expelled by the Irish, were, by various acts, again vested in the crown, which *impeached almost every grant of land antecedent to that period. Nor did later grants afford a full security.* If any former grant subsisted at the time when they were made; if the patents passed in Ireland were not exactly agreeable to the grant; if both did not accurately correspond with the ori-

[203] Hume, III. 306.
[204] Idem, 307.
[205] Leland, II. 547.
[206] Ibid.

entire sixth part of the nation of their property, —after having dispersed them here and there, as suited his purpose,—after having transported a large portion of them to the wild wastes of Connaught and Munster,—after having impressed into his armies such of them as "had not cattle or followers of their own," we are mocked with the absurd falsehood, that "*he took them under his protection;*" just such "protection" as the lawless pirate extends to the peaceful mariners on board an unarmed merchant vessel.

Leland, of whom we have so frequently had occasion to make honourable mention, runs the same race of candour, and arrives at the same goal of truth, as Hume. He bestows not one word on the turpitude of plundering, probably, one hundred and fifty thousand people of their patrimony, for the crimes of two great men, never proved, never attempted to be proved, and resting wholly on a ridiculous, absurd, and anonymous letter, or a tale equally absurd, which is incompatible with the story of the letter; which

ginal warrant transmitted from England; if any defect appeared in expressing the tenure, *any mistake in point of form*, *any advantage taken from general savings or clauses* in the patents, or *any exceptions to be made in law*, which is sufficiently fruitful in affording them, there was an end of the grant, and of the estate which it conveyed. Thus was EVERY MAN'S ENJOYMENT OF HIS POSSESSIONS PRECARIOUS AND DISPUTABLE, at a time when commissions were awarded to inquire by what title he enjoyed it."[207]

[207] Leland, II. 548.

crimes, if proved, ought not, I beg leave to repeat, to involve the innocent people, who were offered up on the altars of rapine.

"James," says Leland, "who affected to derive his glory from the arts of peace, resolved to dispose of those lands in such manner as might introduce all the happy consequences of peace and cultivation. *The experience of ages bears the most honourable testimony to the design:* and Ireland must acknowledge, that here were the first foundations laid of its affluence and security."[208]

"Such was the general scheme of this *famous northern plantation, so honourable to the king*, and of such consequence to the kingdom of Ireland."[209]

"The passion for plantation, which James indulged, *was actuated by the fairest and most captivating motives.* He considered himself as the destined reformer and civilizer of a rude people; and was impatient of the glory of teaching a whole nation the valuable arts of life; of improving their lands, extending their commerce, and refining their manners."[210]

The cravings of the passion for spoliation and plantation, with which James was devoured, when he had exhausted all the pretences of conspiracy, were by no means lulled to rest. He broke new ground; and availed himself of claims arising from the conquest of Henry II. and of concessions made by that monarch, to despoil those whose ancestors had been in undisturbed possession for centuries. To this system of rapine the polished Leland devotes eleven lines, without one decisive word of censure or disapprobation. It is true, he hints that all is not exactly as it should be.

[208] Leland, II. 545. [209] Idem, 512. [210] Idem, 545.

"In the pursuit of this favourite object, he *had sometimes recourse to claims, which the old natives deemed unjust.* The seizure of those lands, whose possessors *had meditated* rebellion, and fled from the sentence of the law, produced little clamour or murmuring. But when he recurred to the concessions made by Henry II. *to invalidate* TITLES DERIVED FROM A POSSESSION OF SOME CENTURIES, the *apparent severity* had its full effect on those who were not acquainted with the refinements of law, and not prepossessed in favour of such refinements, when employed to divest them of their ancient property."[211]

To this sentence, the reader's attention is specially invited. When Leland informs us, that the natives *deemed* the king's claims unjust, it is fair to infer, that he himself believed them just, or at least that there was reason to doubt on the subject. But what was the nature of those claims? They are stated by Leland himself, at the close of the sentence. They were grounded on concessions four hundred years old. Yet of those claims, which, if universally admitted, would forfeit nearly the whole globe, this candid and impartial writer simply informs his abused reader, that "the old natives" [were so unreasonable, that they] "*deemed them unjust.*" The interpolated parenthesis in this sentence is, I think, by no means forced or strained. It is the natural form in which the phraseology presents itself to the mind's eye.

The term "apparent severity" would be appropriately applied to the rigorous exaction of a

[211] Leland, II. 545.

fine fairly incurred, to the unrelenting infliction of the full measure of punishment for crimes committed, or to the confiscation of property duly forfeited; but it is a miserable departure from historical justice, to apply it, as in the present instance, to an act of absolute regal robbery; for the dispossession of persons whose families had undisputed possession for centuries, on such grounds as Leland states, is undoubted robbery. What would be said of the historian who should descant on the "apparent severity" of Black-beard or Morgan, the pirates, in their attacks on the defenceless inhabitants of Lima or Cuzco, or the "apparent severity" of William III. in the massacre of Glenco, or the persecution and ruin of the ill-fated Scotch colony at Darien?

Before the poor plundered people were expelled from their homes and farms, and turned adrift on the world, they made a legal effort to prove the wickedness and injustice of the procedure; "to maintain," in the language of Sir John Davies, "that they had estates of inheritance in their possessions, which their chief could not forfeit." Sir John, the attorney-general, pleaded against their claims; and has fortunately left on record his speech on the subject,[A] which

[A] "The inhabitants of this country do border upon the English Pale, where they have many acquaintances and alliances; by means whereof they have learned *to talk of a freehold and estates of inheritance, which the poor natives of Fermandgh and Tyrconnel could not speak of;* although these men had no

exhibits a most extraordinary specimen of chicane and quibble, that would have better become

other nor better estate than they; that is, only a scambling and transitory possession, at the pleasure of the chief of every sept.

"When the proclamation was published touching their removal (which was done in the public Sessions-House, the lord deputy and commissioners being present) a lawyer of the Pale, retained by them, did endeavour *to maintain that they had estates of inheritance in their possessions*, which their chief lords could not forfeit; and therefore, in their name, desired two things: first, that they might be admitted to traverse the offices which had been found of those lands; secondly, that they might have the benefit of a proclamation made about five years since, whereby the persons, lands, and goods, of all his majesty's subjects, were taken into his royal protection.

"To this the king's attorney, being commanded by the lord deputy, made answer: That he was glad that this occasion was offered, of declaring and setting forth his majesty's just title, as well for his majesty's honour (who, BEING THE MOST JUST PRINCE LIVING, WOULD NOT DISPOSSESS THE MEANEST OF HIS SUBJECTS WRONGFULLY, TO GAIN MANY SUCH KINGDOMS) as for the satisfaction of the natives themselves, and of all the world; for his majesty's right, it shall appear, said he, that his majesty may and ought to dispose of these lands, in such manner as he hath done, and is about to do, *in law*, *in conscience*, *and in honour*.

"In law; whether the case be to be ruled by our law of England, which is in force, or by their own Brehon law, which is abolished, and adjudged no law, but a lewd custom.

"It is our rule in our law, that *the king is lord paramount of all the land in the kingdom, and that all his subjects hold their possessions of him, mediate or immediate*.

"It is another rule of our law, that where the tenant's estate doth fail and determine, the lord, of whom the land is holden, may enter and dispose thereof at his pleasure.

"Then those lands in the county of Cavan which was O'Rilie's country, are all holden of the king: and because the

an Old Bailey pettifogging attorney, than such a high and responsible officer of the crown. He

captainship or chiefrey of O'Rilie is abolished by act of Parliament, by stat. 2. of Elizabeth; and also because two of the chief lords elected by the country have been lately slain in rebellion, (which is an attainder in law) these lands are holden immediately of his majesty.

" If then the king's majesty be immediate chief lord of these lands, let us see what estates the tenants or possessors have, by the rules of the common law of England.

" Either they have an estate of inheritance or a lesser estate: a lesser estate they do not claim; or if they did, they ought to show the creation thereof, which they cannot do.

" If they have an estate of inheritance, their lands ought to descend to a certain heir; but neither their chiefries nor their tenancies ever descend to a certain heir; therefore they have no estate of inheritance.

" Their chiefries were ever carried in a course of tannistry, to the eldest and strongest of the sept, who held the same during life, if he were not ejected by a stronger.

" This estate of the chieftain or tannist hath been lately adjudged no estate in law, but only a transitory and scambling possession.

" Their inferior tenancies did run in another course, like the old gavelkind in Wales, where the bastards had their portions, as well as the legitimate; which portion they held not in perpetuity, but the chief of the sept did once in two or three years shuffle and change their possessions, by new partitions and divisions; which made their estates so uncertain, as that, by opinion of all the judges in this kingdom, this pretended custom of gavelkind is adjudged and declared void in law.

" And as these men had no certain estates of inheritance, so did they never till now claim any such estate, nor conceive that *their lawful heirs* should inherit the land which they possessed; which is manifest by two arguments.

" 1. *They never esteemed lawful matrimony, to the end that they might have lawful heirs.*

sought to convince them, that "his majesty was *the most just prince living*, and would not

"2. *They never did build any houses, nor plant orchards or gardens, nor take any care of their posterities.*

"If these men had no estates in law, either in their mean chiefries or in their inferior tenancies, it followeth, that *if his majesty*, who is the undoubted lord paramount, *do seize and dispose these lands*, they can make no title against his majesty or his patentees, and consequently cannot be admitted to traverse any office of those lands; for without shewing a title, no men can be admitted to traverse an office.

"*Thus then it appears, that as well by the Irish custom as the law of England, his majesty may, at his pleasure, seize those lands, and dispose thereof.* The only scruple which remains, consists in this point: whether the king may, *in conscience or honour remove the ancient tenants*, and bring in strangers among them.

"Truly his majesty may not only take this course lawfully, *but is bound in conscience so to do.*

"For, being the undoubted rightful king of this realm, so as the people and land are committed by the Divine Majesty to his charge and government, his majesty *is bound in conscience* to use all lawful and just courses to reduce his people from barbarism to civility: the neglect whereof heretofore hath been laid as an imputation upon the crown of England. Now *civility cannot possibly* be planted among them" [without plundering them of their estates] "but by this mixed plantation of civil men, which likewise could not be without *removal and transplantation of some of the natives*, and settling their possessions in a course of common law; for if themselves were suffered to possess the whole country, as their septs have done for many hundreds of years past, they would never, to the end of the world, *build houses, make townships or villages, or manure or improve the land as it ought to be;* therefore *it stands neither with Christian policy nor conscience*, to suffer so good and fruitful a country to lie waste like a wilderness, when his majesty may lawfully" [reduce the right owners to beggary,

*dispossess* the meanest of his subjects wrongfully, to gain many such kingdoms." This was a very

and] "dispose it to such persons as will make a civil plantation thereupon.

"Again, *his majesty may take this course* IN CONSCIENCE; because *it tendeth to the good of the inhabitants many ways;* for half their lands doth now lie waste; by reason whereof that which is inhabited is not improved to half the value: but when the undertakers are planted among them, (there being place and scope enough both for them and for the natives,)" [yet a large portion of them were transported to the wild wastes in Connaught and Munster,] "and that all the land shall be fully stocked and manured, *five hundred acres will be of better value than five thousand are now.* Besides, where before their estates were altogether uncertain and transitory, so as their heirs did never inherit, they shall now have certain estates of inheritance, the portion allotted unto them, which they and their children after them, shall enjoy with security.

"Lastly, this transplantation of the natives is made by his majesty, *rather like a father than like a lord or monarch.* The Romans transplanted whole nations out of Germany into France; the Spaniards lately removed all the Moors out of Grenada into Barbary, without providing them any new seats there: *when the English Pale was first planted, all the natives were clearly expelled, so as not one Irish family had so much as an acre of freehold, in all the five counties of the Pale:* and now, within these four years past, the Græmes were removed from the borders of Scotland to this kingdom, and had not one foot of land allotted to them here: but these natives of Cavan have competent portions of land assigned to them, many of them in the same barony where they dwelt before; and such as are removed are planted in the same county, so as *his majesty doth in this imitate the skilful husbandman, who doth remove his fruit trees, not with a purpose to extirpate and destroy them, but that they may bring better and sweeter fruit after the transplantation.*"[212]

[212] Davies, 276.

handsome and suitable exordium to a discourse intended to justify the *dispossession* of probably an hundred and fifty thousand subjects, great and mean together. As a proper corollary to this, he declared, that "his majesty not only might, but absolutely ought to dispose of the lands as he had done, in law, in conscience, and in honour," although a gross violation of law, conscience, and honour. He gravely urged, that they had "no certain estates of inheritance," which, he says, "is manifest by two arguments," the cogency of which cannot fail to strike the reader with some force. The first is,

That "they never esteemed lawful matrimony, to the end they might have lawful heirs;"

And the second,

That "*they never did build any houses, nor plant orchards or gardens, nor take any care of their posterities.*"

Who can read such miserable chicanery, without ineffable disgust at the impudence, and abhorrence of the fraud and imposture, that attempted to justify the spoliation of possessions, many of which had descended from father to son for perhaps five hundred or a thousand years, because the owners did not "*esteem lawful matrimony*," nor "*plant orchards or gardens, nor build any houses?*" and this covered over with the holy mantle of "*law, conscience, and honour?*"

Not satisfied with this reasoning, he undertook to prove, that the plantation was absolutely

for the good of the natives; for that by this Agrarian hocus pocus, five hundred acres thenceforward would produce more than five thousand had previously done. It followed, of course, that the man who was plundered of four thousand five hundred acres out of five thousand, was actually, according to this logic, a gainer by the robbery!

He closes his discourse by asserting, that the transplantation of the natives was made "more *like a father*, than like a lord or monarch." In proof of this position, he displays great learning on the transplantation of nations by the Romans, the Spaniards, and the English themselves, in former times; and states, that when the English Pale was first planted, the natives were so wholly expelled, that "*not one Irish family had so much as an acre of freehold in all the five counties.*" This argument ought to have removed all doubts from the minds of the Irish; as it proved that the English had, from time immemorial, a prescriptive right to seize their lands, and not leave them so much as "one acre of freehold," if they judged proper; and, of course, that James I. did prove himself "a father," when he refrained from availing himself of his rights to their full extent.

The whole of the argument, if such miserable quibbles and trash can be called argument, is to be found in the preceding note, which is particularly recommended to the attention of the reader. I have given it *in extenso*, that he may

have a fair sample of the "law, conscience, and honour," displayed towards the "savage Irish," during the millenium of forty years, when, according to Clarendon, "whatsoever their land, labour, or industry produced, was their own, being free from fear of having it taken from them by the king, on any pretence whatsoever."

It is extraordinary that the Bœotian dulness of the Irish rendered them incapable of comprehending the cogency of Sir John Davies's reasoning: it was too elegant and refined for their uncultivated minds. The poor idiots could not conceive why they should be stripped of their estates, because an anonymous and nonsensical letter had been dropped in the Privy Council Chamber.

The lord deputy, however, had stronger argument than Sir John, to which they were forced to submit:

> "The natives seemed not unsatisfied in reason, though they remained in their passions discontented, *being much grieved to leave their possessions to strangers*, which they had so long after their manner enjoyed; howbeit, MY LORD DEPUTY DID SO MIX THREATS WITH ENTREATY, PRECIBUSQUE MINAS REGALITER ADDIT, as they promised to give way to the undertakers, if the sheriff, by warrant of the commissioners, did put them in possession."[213]

He judiciously "mixed *threats* with entreaties, *precibusque minas regaliter addit*," that is, in the true polite Tyburn style, persuasion on the

[213] Davies, 284.

tongue, and the pistol in hand. Whatever difficulty there might be in yielding to the one, was removed by the application of the other. There is no mode of conviction so powerful. Make a low bow, with *entreaties*, and add *threats*, properly supported, in case of refusal. He must have been a most stubborn disputant, that could resist the conviction arising from the overwhelming arguments of the deputy, with an army at his command, the power of proclaiming martial law at pleasure, and the executioner ready at hand, to support his reasoning with a rope. Neither Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke, Pitt, nor Fox, could withstand such logic.

It were endless to recapitulate the odious features of this "*magnificent project*." With one more, I shall close the catalogue of oppression.

The adjustment of the rent, payable by the different descriptions of persons to whom these lands were allotted, affords a striking instance of gross partiality and injustice. The undertakers, who had the choicest portions of the soil, were to pay to the crown a rent of six shillings and eight-pence, for every sixty acres; the servitors, ten shillings; and the natives, who were plundered of their paternal estates, and reduced from the enviable condition of independent freeholders to that of tenants, were to pay thirteen shillings and four-pence.[214] That is to say, the despoiled

[214] Hibernica, 125, 128, 129.

owners of the soil were to pay exactly twice as much rent for inferior lands, as the despoilers paid for the superior: and, to add to the iniquity, the undertakers and servitors were to pay no rent till the third year, being rent-free for two years; whereas the natives were to pay the second year, being rent-free only one year.

## CHAPTER VIII.

*The Egyptians spoiled once more. Regal rapine, in the King's and Queen's counties, Leitrim, Longford, and Westmeath. Three hundred and eighty-five thousand acres forfeited, for the charitable purpose of civilizing the natives.*

JAMES'S predominating passion for plunder and plantation had been tolerably satisfied with the spoliation of Ulster, where, by a princely exercise of *law, honour, and conscience*, he had involved in ruin the once proud owners of princely estates, raised to rank and fortune many of the lowest orders of society, and, in a word, changed the whole face of the country. He for a while rested from his labours: but the devouring lust of plunder and plantation returned; and, being too imperiously craving to be resisted, he resolved to gratify it. Encouraged by the facility with which he had effected his spoliations in Ulster, he displayed himself, on this occasion, in the bold character of a public depredator, scorning disguise or artifice. It was thought unnecessary to hire *letter-droppers*, or false witnesses, to swear to plots or conspiracies. Without any of the tricks played off by his predecessors, or

by himself, in the province of Ulster, he plundered his subjects, in King's and Queen's counties, Leitrim, Longford, and Westmeath, of estates to the amount of three hundred and eighty-five thousand acres. Thus this vain, sottish, contemptible, and rapacious monarch, in a time of profound peace, at two successive operations, seized about a twentieth part of the whole island; five hundred thousand acres in Ulster, and three hundred and eighty-five thousand in Leinster: and it is more than probable, that, had his inglorious career continued as long as that of some of his successors, he would have seized every acre of the island, belonging to the Roman Catholics; for, after his depredations in Leinster were completed, he was seriously occupied in preparations for the plantation of Connaught,* when death humanely rescued his Irish subjects from the merciless gripe of the canting, hypocritical oppressor, who had, throughout his reign, plundered them as "*a father, not as a monarch*," and, according to the sovereign dictates of "*law, honour, and conscience*," reduced them to beggary here, for "the good of their souls hereafter."

* "The project recommended to the king was nothing less than that of establishing *an extensive plantation in Connaught*, SIMILAR TO THAT OF ULSTER; and, *in his rage for reformation*, IT WAS MOST FAVOURABLY RECEIVED."[215]

[215] Leland, II. 558.

But, as it was only "*spoiling the Egyptians*," to borrow a phrase from Rob Roy, it is passed over by Leland, Carte, and Hume, not merely as an innocent, but as a necessary measure; nay, it appears from their statements as entitled to applause.

Leland informs us, that those counties, "by their situation and circumstances, required particular regulation." And what was the "*particular regulation*," which they required? It was simply, that all the rights of property, held sacred among the most barbarous nations, the Moors and Algerines, should be basely invaded by a wretched monarch, who, as I have already hinted, has been fraudulently ranked among the civilizers and benefactors of mankind:

"Naturally strong, and difficult of access, they afforded, in the very heart of the island, a safe retreat and shelter to the old inhabitants, who were tenacious of their barbarous customs, nestling in their filthy cottages in winter, in summer wandering with their cattle over the mountains. Through these districts, the Irish insurgents had usually passed from Connaught or Ulster, to annoy the Pale. They had served for a passage to Tyrone and his forces into Munster, and a retreat in his inglorious flight from Kinsale. In time of peace, they were the safe receptacles of robbers, where they defied the ministers of justice; and, surrounded with woods, bogs, and mountains, lived in a sort of independence, and contemptuous resistance to the law. *To reduce these savages to order and subjection*," [that is, reader, those savages, than whom, according to Sir John Davies and Edward Coke, NO PEOPLE UNDER THE SUN LOVED JUSTICE BETTER; and who were MORE FEARFUL TO OFFEND THE LAW THAN THE ENGLISH] "inquisitions were held to examine the king's title to the whole

or any part of their lands. It was found, that *some of them had been anciently possessed by English settlers*, who, in the disorders of the kingdom, had been expelled by the old natives, and *which were therefore vested in the crown*, as the lands of absentees; *others appeared to have been forfeited by rebellion.* So that *James deemed himself entitled to make a distribution of* THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND ACRES *in these counties*, to such proprietors, and in such proportions, as might promote the general welfare and security, the extension of commerce, and the civility of the natives. The large portions re-granted to the ancient proprietors, on permanent tenures, reconciled many to this new scheme of plantation."[216]

Language hardly affords terms of contempt and disgust, adequate to brand the writer, who can cant and whine, in extenuation of such atrocious spoliation. If the natives "nestled in filthy cottages," it proceeded from the oppression of the wretched government under which they groaned, and which, in the lapse of ages, hardly ever adopted a single measure dictated by sound or magnanimous policy, or calculated to claim the respect or gratitude of its Irish subjects.

In the same hacknied strain, Carte cants on the subject of this immense depredation:

"The peace of the kingdom was very precarious, whilst those countries remained in a sort of independence on the state, and its inhabitants lived in a contempt of its laws. The king *saw it necessary to reduce them into the same order and subjection*" [that is, the same state of beggary and ruin in which he had involved the people of the six counties in Ulster] "as the rest of the kingdom: and therefore, by a special commission, in 1614, had empowered the lord deputy Chiches-

[216] Leland, II. 539.

ter and others to take a view of the countries," [and so ascertain how much he might seize] "and inquire into the title which the crown had to them, or any part thereof; the estate, number, and condition of the inhabitants; the chiefries, claims, customs, and rents of the present lords; and the best way of reducing and settling them."[217]

I have given these statements at length, that the reader may have a full view of the grounds on which the depredation took place, and may decide on its propriety or justice, and on the merits of the writers from whom the accounts are taken. The flimsy pretext, that "the peace of the country was precarious," and that "these counties were receptacles of robbers," will not stand a moment's examination. Fraud and rapine never wanted a pretext of extenuation or justification. The fable of the wolf and the lamb affords a proper type of this course of proceeding.

If those counties were receptacles of robbers, the proper corrective was to open assizes, and employ courts, sheriffs, and executioners; not to rob the people of their lands, and turn them out on the highway, to retaliate on the unwary passenger the depredations they suffered from those whose office imposed on them the duty of protection.

The admission of such a paltry defence of so base a system of rapine and plunder, reflects indelible disgrace on Leland and Carte, and ought

[217] Carte, I. 23.

to consign their histories to utter oblivion. Had they the slightest knowledge of their duty, or did they pay attention to its discharge, they would have marked the act with the brand of infamy and reprobation, which it had so richly earned. There was not a subject in his dominions, whose estate the rapacious monarch might not have seized, under some pretence or other, as valid; nor, in fact, is there an estate under the star-spangled canopy of heaven, which might not be seized with equal justice, and equal regard to "*law, honour, and conscience.*"

In the "famous northern plantation, so honourable to king James," according to the very accurate Leland, we have seen that the natives were despoiled of the paltry modicum of the soil, which the rapacity of the monarch had allotted them, to support a miserable existence. As might be expected, the Leinster adventurers, in order to keep their Ulster friends in countenance, followed their captivating example, and defrauded the natives to precisely the same extent. This verifies the old Latin adage,

"Ad regis exemplum totus componitur orbis."

"In the county of Longford, *the natives in general had scarce a third part of their former possessions, either in number of acres or in value of profitable ground*, allotted them. The arts of admeasurement were well understood in those days; and, as the king had directed a certain quantity of unprofitable ground, bog, wood, and mountain, to be thrown into the several proportions of profitable land allotted to British and natives,

*a great latitude of judgment* was left to the commissioners, *which some of them knew how to make use of for their advantage.*

"Hence *several persons were turned out of large estates of profitable land*, and had only *a small pittance*, *less than a fourth part*, assigned them for it, in barren ground."[218]

"In the small county of Longford, we find that *twenty-five of one sept were all deprived of their estates*, *without the least compensation*, *or any means of subsistence allotted them.*"[219]

We may form a tolerably accurate idea of the frightful extent to which the spirit of rapine was carried, from the specimen here exhibited. What a hideous specimen! Proprietors expelled from their large paternal estates, in rich vallies and "profitable lands," and receiving "a fourth part of the amount in barren ground." Let us bring the matter home to an American reader. Suppose a descendant of William Penn, settled on the rich lands in Lancaster, Chester, or Delaware counties, and owning one thousand acres, worth one hundred and fifty dollars per acre, expelled from thence, because he "*built no houses, nor planted orchards or gardens;*" banished to some of the barren lands of Northumberland or Lycoming, with two hundred and fifty acres, hardly worth one dollar per acre; thus receiving, in lord Clarendon's millenium, "that blessed condition of peace and security," two hundred and fifty dollars, as an equivalent for an hundred and fifty thousand. This is a very fair view of the equitable doctrine of *equivalents*, as studied and

[218] Carte, I. 23. [219] Leland, II. 546.

carried into practice by those upright agents of the pious James, who, to use the words of Leland, were employed "*to reduce those savages to order and subjection.*"

But the case of those wretched people, placed on the "barren lands," and with an *equivalent* of one-fourth of the number of acres whereof they were plundered, was not, it appears, the most grievous that occurred. We see, that of one single sept, or family, twenty-five were turned adrift, "*without the least compensation, or any means of subsistence allotted them.*" How many twenty-fives, how many hundreds, were thus turned out, it is impossible to conceive. But it is not presuming very far, to suppose, as the one side was destitute of defence, and the other of every sense of honour and justice, that the cases were numerous; and that there were hundreds, perhaps thousands, who were driven out of house and home, and turned loose on society, "without any means of subsistence allotted them;" and this, let me repeat, (it can never be too often repeated) during a period, in which, with the most unblushing falsehood, Clarendon has dared to impose on a betrayed and deluded world, the monstrous assertion, that "whatever their land, labour, or industry produced, was their own, being free from fear of having it taken from them by the king, upon any pretence whatever, without their own consent."

When the monarch of three powerful kingdoms, who ought to be a pattern of honour, honesty, and justice, and, as Sir John Davies declared, to have scorned to "*dispossess the meanest of his subjects wrongfully*," becomes a common depredator on their estates, and acts the part of the ravening wolf, instead of that of the vigilant shepherd, it is not wonderful that such portion of those subjects as form a privileged cast, should prey upon and devour the others. This has ever been, and ever will be, the result, in all analogous cases.

## CHAPTER IX.

*Projected spoliation of Connaught. Jury fined eighty thousand pounds sterling, for not perjuring themselves by a false verdict. Historical obliquity.*

THE project formed by the pious James, of an extensive plantation in Connaught, for the purpose of *spoiling the Egyptians*, those wretches who "did not esteem lawful matrimony," who "built no houses, and planted no orchards nor gardens," was, as shown in the preceding chapter, defeated by death, who snatched him away, in the midst of his career, to render an account, in another world, before the omniscient Judge of mankind, of his rapine and depredation in this. But, alas! the respite thus afforded to the western province of Ireland, was of short duration. During the succeeding reign, the nefarious project was revived, by the arrogant, rapacious, and vindictive Wentworth, who meditated nothing less, according to Leland, than the subversion of the title of every estate in the province.*

* "His project was *nothing less than to subvert the title to every estate in every part of Connaught*, and to establish a new plantation through this whole province; a project, which,

For this stupendous scheme, Wentworth was peculiarly fitted. He possessed great energy of character, and talents of a high order; but was withheld by no sense of shame, no tie of honour, no regard to equity, and no "compunctious visitings of conscience." He completely filled Sallust's character of Catiline:

"Alieni appetens, sui profusus."

Thus fortified with every requisite of head and heart to qualify him for a remorseless oppressor, he undertook to carry this project into execu-

when first proposed, in the late reign, was received with horror and amazement, but which suited the undismayed and enterprising genius of lord Wentworth. For this he had opposed the confirmation of the royal graces, transmitted to lord Faulkland, and taken to himself the odium of so flagrant a violation of the royal promise. The parliament was at an end; and the deputy at leisure to execute a scheme, which, as it was offensive and alarming, required a cautious and deliberate procedure. *Old records of state*, and *the memorials of ancient monasteries*, were ransacked, to ascertain the king's original title to Connaught. It was soon discovered, that in the grant of *Henry the Third* to Richard De Burgo, *five cantreds were reserved to the crown*, adjacent to the castle of Athlone; that THIS GRANT INCLUDED THE WHOLE REMAINDER OF THE PROVINCE, which was now alleged to have been forfeited by Aedn O'Connor, the Irish provincial chieftain; that the lands and lordship of De Burgo, descended lineally to Edward the Fourth; and were confirmed to the crown by a statute of Henry the Seventh. The ingenuity of court lawyers was employed to invalidate all patents granted to the possessors of these lands, from the reign of queen Elizabeth."[220]

[220] Leland, II. 35.

tion, and would have infallibly succeeded, but for the convulsions in Scotland and England, which called him to aid his master, in whose cause he lost a head which his career in Ireland had indubitably forfeited.

Few men have performed a distinguished part in society, whose history is so contradictorily narrated. A correct account of him is still a desideratum. Clarendon, Nalson, Carte, Hume, and all the long train of monarchical writers, whine and lament over his grave, as if he had been a mirror of virtue,—a Phocion, an Aristides, a Socrates, a De Witt, or a Washington; and as if he had been offered up, an immaculate victim, to popular rage. But those who take a correct view of his career, must acknowledge that he was a bloated mass of almost every species of vice and crime of which a public officer is capable.

Candour, however, calls for the acknowledgment that the proceedings against him, in the trial of the impeachment, were in many respects informal and irregular; and that he was offered up, by the republican party in the Long Parliament, full as much to appease their resentment at his apostacy from their cause, and to allay their fears of his talents and influence, as for his crimes, atrocious as they were. But, whatever may have been the informality of the course pursued, few public functionaries have ever been brought to the block, whose fate was more com-

pletely sanctioned by the claims of substantial justice. No man ever had much less reason to complain of informality: for whoever compares the proceedings on his trial, with those on the trial of lord Mountnorris, will be satisfied that there was as much difference between them, as between the court of Herod or Pontius Pilate, and that of Trajan or Antoninus. The proceedings of the court held on lord Mountnorris were of the most murderous character.

It is not extravagant to aver, that the aggregate crimes of hundreds of men, who have been offered up on gibbets, as victims to offended Justice, for depredations on property, would not equal the guilt of one single act of Wentworth,—the fine imposed on the sheriff and grand jury of Galway: the naked fact of which case is, that the jurors, probably twenty in number, were each fined four thousand pounds, or eighty thousand pounds sterling, equal, according to the present value of money, to about two hundred thousand pounds, or nearly nine hundred thousand dollars, because they resisted the depredations of this *modern Aristides*, and refused to find a title in the crown, grounded on the invasion of Henry II. or on claims arising immediately from that source. The sheriff was fined a thousand pounds, for returning such a jury. More of this anon.

Here an apology is due to the reader. This statement is somewhat out of its place, in point of time. Let us return to the progress of Went-

worth; who began his career with the county of Roscommon,* where he made a frothy address, in which he canted on the honour and equity of his royal master, and the benevolence of his views towards his good subjects of Connaught. But the jet of it was the comfortable information, that his majesty was indifferent whether they found for him or not; conveying thereby a clear idea that he would adopt some other mode of attaining his right; the "*path of which lay so open and plain before him.*" He gave them to understand, that if they consulted their own true interest, they would find for the crown, as they

* "Wentworth, at the head of the commissioners of plantation, proceeded to the western province. The inhabitants of the county of Leitrim had already acknowledged the king's title to their lands, and submitted to a plantation. It was now deemed expedient to begin with those of Roscommon. The commission was opened in this county; the evidences of the king's title produced, examined, and submitted to a jury, formed of the principal inhabitants, purposely (as the lord deputy expressed it) that '*they might answer the king a round fine in the castle-chamber, in case they should prevaricate.*' They were told by Wentworth, that his majesty's intention, *in establishing his undoubted title, was to make them a rich and civil people;* that he purposed not to deprive them of their just possessions, but to invest them with a considerable part of his own; that he needed not their interposition, to vindicate his right, which might be established by the usual course of law, upon an information of intrusion; but that he wished his people to share with him *in the honour and profit of the glorious and excellent work* he was now to execute; to his majesty it was indifferent, whether their verdict should acknowledge or deny his title."[221]

[221] Leland, III. 36.

would then have better terms than "if they were passionately resolved to go over all bounds to their own wills."[222]

One part of this address has escaped much observation heretofore, which nevertheless deserves the most pointed attention. It would afford room for a commentary of a volume on the hideous oppression and rapacity of the Irish government:

> "To manifest his majesty's justice and honour, I thought fit to let them know," says the satrap, "that it was his majesty's gracious pleasure, that *any man's counsel should be fully and willingly heard, in defence of their respective rights;* being A FAVOUR NEVER BEFORE AFFORDED TO ANY, UPON TAKING THESE KIND OF INQUISITIONS."[223]

Here a pause, a solemn pause, is necessary. A government, whose paramount duty is to protect the persons and property of its subjects, pursues for centuries a piratical system of legal warfare on their property; it advances claims to estates, one, two, three, or four hundred years old; it hangs fines and imprisonment over the heads of the jurors; it bribes the judges; and let it be deeply engraven on the mind of every man of candour, that, for above four hundred years, the men whose estates it sought to spoliate, were never, till the time of Wentworth, allowed the favour of "*being heard, by counsel, in defence of their respective rights!*" Tripoli, Algiers, and Morocco might be safely defied to produce a parallel.

[222] Strafford, I. 442. [223] Ibid.

The reader cannot be surprised that the jurors of Roscommon, under these circumstances, found for the crown. Nothing less could have been expected:

"The presence and interposition of a lord deputy, whose character and temper were fitted to operate on men's passions, had probably their full effect on this occasion. The king's title was found, without scruple or hesitation; and the verdict attended with a petition for an equitable treatment of present proprietors, and a due provision for the church."[224]

The example of Roscommon had a decided influence on the counties of Mayo and Sligo, where the king's title was found, without difficulty.

Galway remained. All the arts of the deputy were in vain. The jury refused to find the bills; and, as already stated, were enormously fined and imprisoned.*

* "The jury of the county of Galway was summoned to meet at Portumna, on Aug. 13, 1635, and consisted of the principal gentlemen of the county. The king's title to all the lands in it, except such as belonged to the church, or had been granted out by the patents of his predecessors, WAS PROVED BY THE CONQUEST OF KING HENRY II. and the grant he made of it to Roderic, lord of Connaught; by the grant of Henry III. to Richard De Burgo, of twenty-five cantreds, out of thirty, whereof the whole consists, upon a rent of three hundred marks for the first five years, and of five hundred for ever afterwards; and by the payment of this rent into the exchequer, and the allowances thereof in the sheriff's accompt from time to time; by the descent of King Edward IV. from Lionel, duke of Clarence, and the heiress of De Burgo; and

[224] Leland, III. 37.

It is painful to find, that every step we take in these investigations, affords additional evidence of the prejudice, the sinister views, or the incapacity of the writers of Irish history. Leland

by the vesting of their lands in the crown, by the statute of 10. Henry VII. c. 15.

"The jury, however, UPON PRETENCE THAT THE ACQUISITION OF HENRY II. WAS NOT A CONQUEST, but a submission of the inhabitants; that the grant to Roderic was barely a composition, whereby the king had only the dominion, but not the property of the lands, though the rent paid sufficiently proved the latter; that, in tracing the descent to Edward IV. proof had not been made of Lionel duke of Clarence's possession; and that the statute of Henry VII. related to tenures rather than to lands, though *no man could be proved to have any land there in property at that time*, thought fit to find against the king's title, (though no grant was produced from the crown to any ancestor of the possessors, and WHERE NO BODY ELSE HAS A RIGHT, THE KING'S TITLE MUST BE GOOD;) and when called upon to declare in whom the freehold was vested, (if not in the crown) they refused to do so. The lord deputy highly resented this proceeding; and, conceiving it would be of ill example to the rest of the kingdom, and would retard, if not defeat, the execution of his project, caused the jurors to be prosecuted, for a combination with the sheriff who empannelled them, to defeat the king of his right. They were tried on the 27th of May, 1636, FINED FOUR THOUSAND POUNDS A MAN, SENTENCED TO IMPRISONMENT TILL IT WAS PAID, AND TO AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT, UPON THEIR KNEES, IN COURT AND AT THE ASSIZES, OF THEIR OFFENCE, in *refusing to find what they ought to have found, upon the evidence produced*, and which their neighbours had actually found upon the same."[225]

[225] Carte, I. 82.

narrates, without the slightest censure, this Connaught spoliation, unsupported by *letter-dropping*, conspiracy, rebellion, or any accusation of *not building houses or planting orchards.*

Of all the various instances of the obliquity of Carte's history, there is none more extraordinary than the view he gives of this hideous affair. He absolutely defends the proceedings of Strafford; and unqualifiedly censures the jury, who, "on the evidence produced, ought to have found," he says, "as their neighbours had found." Among his accusations of the jury, the first is, their grounding their refusal of finding a title to the province, on "THE PRETENCE," as this prejudiced historian says, "that the subjection of the country under Henry II. was a submission, not a conquest." In what a state of delirium must the mind of the man be, who could be so far lost to a sense of reason or justice, as to style this sound and irrefragable plea "*a pretence*," or to countenance any claims resting on such untenable ground! That in a country, which for centuries had been despoiled on pretexts as iniquitous, such claims should be advanced by a depredator of the character of Wentworth, is not wonderful: but that an historian, writing, a century afterwards, with all the facts before him, on which to form a correct estimate, should for a moment admit that the titles to estates, held in the same families for ages, should be affected by the ques-

tion of the conquest or submission of the country, is inexpressibly astonishing. The invasion of Henry took place in 1172; and the spoliation of Connaught was projected in 1636, that is, four hundred and sixty-four years afterwards. Of what consequence could it have been to the proprietors of estates, what was the character of the proceedings of Henry,—whether he received a submission, or made a conquest? Suppose it a submission: does it thence follow, that Charles I. had a right to an acre, or even a perch, of an estate that had descended from heir to heir, for the intermediate four centuries and a half? Suppose it invasion: does that enhance the strength of the claim? Had every man, woman, and child in the whole nation been subdued by, and sworn allegiance to, Henry II. or, to give the argument its utmost force, Henry V. VI. VII. or VIII. could that warrant a jury in finding a title in the crown to the whole of the soil; or justify the imposition of a fine of eighty thousand pounds sterling on the jury, for not finding such title? Could any thing but the most rampant spirit of rapine ever lay a claim on such wretched ground, or any thing but the most dire insanity or obliquity of mind ever undertake the palliation of the vile deed?

We have already stated, that the project miscarried; not through the honour or justice of the monarch or his agents, but through the intestine

troubles at home, which gave them much more serious and finally fatal employment than plundering the inhabitants of Connaught.

We have asserted, that the judges were bribed. This is recorded by Wentworth's own hand. To ensure the assistance of the court, he advised the king to bestow on the lord chief justice and the chief baron, four shillings in the pound, from the first yearly rent raised out of the depredated estates, in order to interest them in promoting the rapine. The "*royal martyr*," worthy of such a representative, gave, and the judges, worthy of such a monarch and such a deputy, received, the wages of their prostitution.

Well might Shakspeare exclaim,

> "Thieves for their robbery have authority,
> When judges steal themselves."

The bribe had the desired effect: for Wentworth says,

> "I have found it, upon observation, to be the best given that ever was; for that by these means they attend that business with as much care and diligence as if it had been their own private; and that *every four shillings*, *once paid*, *would better his majesty's revenue four pounds*."[225]

Who can read this odious detail, without standing aghast with horror? A king conspires with his vicegerent, to despoil his defenceless subjects; and, to ensure success in their flagitious undertaking, they tender a manifest bribe to the judges who are to decide the cause. The amount

[225] Strafford, I. 442.

of this bribe depends on the extent of the depredation. They agree to share among them the spoils; which are divided into five parts, four of which fall to the share of the king and deputy,—the master plunderers; and the fifth to their agents and accomplices, the judges. And yet this king is by bigoted royalists reverenced as an English Marcus Aurelius, the exemplar of every royal virtue!

But the hardened and iniquitous Wentworth was not satisfied with corrupting the judges. He paid equal attention to the jurors, of whom he sought out two kinds;—one poor and needy, who might easily be bribed, "*fit men to serve on juries, who would give furtherance to the king's title;*"[226] and the other very wealthy, whom he might plunder, by heavy fines, if they prevaricated, as he called it. In the latter case, he would have, to use his own words, "persons of such means as *might answer to the king in a round fine,* in the Castle-Chamber;* because the fear of that

* "So general and lasting were the terrors arising from these severe proceedings of the deputy, that, in 1637, the whole body of the gentry of the county of Galway offered to make a surrender of their estates to the crown; and for that purpose sent a letter of attorney to the earl of Clanrickard, then at London, signed by one hundred and twenty-five persons of the best quality in the county. 'At the same time, the still imprisoned sheriff and jurors, instead of seeking redress, petitioned, but in vain, for pardon, offering to acknowledge the deputy's justice and their own errors of judgment, upon con-

[226] Strafford, I. 339.

fine would be apter to produce the desired effect in such persons, than in others who had little or nothing to lose."[227]

The villany of this scheme of depredation far exceeded that practised in former times. Some attention had been till now paid to letters patent, duly authenticated from the crown. These were generally regarded as affording proofs of good titles; and rescued the possessors from the ruin inflicted on their neighbours. But the chief part of the lands, proposed to be spoliated by Wentworth, being fenced round with patents, he found

dition only that they and the rest might be put upon the same footing with the other planted counties; for in these cases, the general rule was, that a fourth part of their land should be taken from the natives, with an increase of rent upon the remainder; but the county of Galway, on account of its former refractoriness, was planted at a double rate; so that they lost half.'

"Wentworth was so far from being satisfied with this submissive petition and offer, that *he insisted upon a public acknowledgment from these jurors, of their having committed not only an error in judgment, but even actual perjury*, in the verdict they had given; which being refused by them, he, besides planting their country at the rate before mentioned, procured an order from the king, that their agents in London should be sent prisoners to Dublin, to be tried before himself in the castle-chamber, for having dared to patronise their cause. These severities, however, raised no small apprehensions in some that were about the king, and even the king himself, lest they might disaffect the people of Ireland, and dispose them to call over the Irish regiments from Flanders to their assistance."[228]

[227] Strafford, I. 442. [228] Curry, I. 157.

that his project would be defeated, and he be deprived of his prey, if he admitted the validity of letters patent. He therefore determined to reject them; and so utterly regardless was he of even the slightest appearance of honour or honesty, that he assigns, as a justification of the extensiveness of his spoliation, the very reason that should have been a shield to rescue the sufferers from his merciless gripe:

"In former plantations in Ireland, all men claiming by letters patents had the full benefit of them, either in enjoying the lands granted them, or other lands equivalent thereunto, whether their letters patent were valid or invalid. And indeed, in those plantations, that favour might better be yielded, where the lands claimed by letters patent were not in any great or considerable proportion, than here, where ALMOST ALL THE LANDS FALLING UNDER PLANTATION ARE GRANTED, OR MENTIONED TO BE GRANTED, BY LETTERS PATENT."[229]

[229] Strafford, II. 139.

## CHAPTER X.

*Wide-spread scene of private spoliation. Needy projectors and rapacious courtiers. Defective titles.*

IN the last chapters, we have exhibited the unbridled spirit of rapine and plunder, by which the Irish were despoiled by their government, during the grand millenium of lord Clarendon and Dr. Warner.

But, execrable as were those proceedings, and profligate and abandoned as were the rulers by whom they were perpetrated, the sufferings and spoliations experienced by the Irish, from individual rapacity,* far exceeded them, in the wide

* "*Ireland had long been a prey to projectors and greedy courtiers*, who procured grants of concealed lands; and, by setting up the king's title, forced the right owners of them, to avoid the plague and expense of a litigation, *to compound with them on what terms they pleased.* It was high time to put a stop to *so scandalous a traffic*, which reflected dishonour upon the crown, alienated the minds of the people from the government, and raised CONTINUAL CLAMOURS AND UNEASINESS IN EVERY PART OF THE KINGDOM. Many proprietors of lands could derive no title from the crown; the letters patents of others were insufficient in law, defective, doubtful, or not plain enough to prevent dispute. Commissions had been granted, from time to time, to remedy these defects, and compositions

scope they embraced, which was the whole extent of the kingdom.

made with the commissioners. But, as these commissions were afterwards either renewed or recalled, and new ones issued out, it was questioned whether, by such later commissions, the said former commissions, and the compositions grounded thereupon, were not revoked, countermanded, and annulled.

"Besides, *the commissions themselves might possibly be defective*, *uncertain*, *or not extend to give the commissioners as much power and authority as they exercised* in making compositions, or passing letters patents to the subject, who, presuming every thing to be rightly done, by persons duly authorized, and his own possession to be fully assured to him, found himself mistaken in the end. For if either the commissions, or the king's letters upon which they were grounded, were lost, or not enrolled and recorded; if the lands and tenements granted, or intended to be granted, in the letters patents, were mis-named, mis-recited, or not named and recited therein; if offices and inquisitions had not been found, for proof of the king's title, before the making of such grants or letters patents; or if there were any defect in such offices and inquisitions; if there were any omission of sufficient and special non obstantes of particular statutes, that ought to have been mentioned in the letters patents; if there were any mistake or omission in the recital of leases upon the premises, or of some part thereof, whether of record or no; if there were any lack of certainty, miscasting, or mis-rating of the true yearly value and rates of such lands and tenements, or of some part thereof, or of the yearly rents out of the premises, or some part thereof mentioned in the letters patents; if there were any mistake in the apportioning or dividing the said rents, or the tenures of any of the land; if the premises, or any part thereof, were in such grants estimated at a less, or even at a greater value than in truth they were; if the towns, villages, places, baronies, hundreds, or counties, where the lands and tenements so granted lay, chanced to be misnamed; if the natures, kinds, sorts, qualities or quantities of such lands and tenements, or

This is perfectly natural; and what might have been inferred from the proceedings of the rulers, even were history silent on the subject. The experience of the world proves, that severe laws and good government frequently fail to repress fraud and violence, even when corporal punishments and penalties are held out in terrorem, to awe the offenders. But, we repeat, when a government assumes the aspect of the plunderer, and sets the alluring example of spoliation; when it violates, in the most profligate manner, the rights of property, held by regular descent, for ages; when, with sacrilegious hand, it tears down all the barriers erected by law, honour, honesty, and justice; but, more particularly than all the rest, when it divides a nation into two casts, and prostrates one, tied neck and heels, at the feet of the other, as the Helots were at the feet of the Spartans,—the native Irish, previous

of any part thereof, were not truly set forth and named; or if, in grants to corporations and bodies politic, whether spiritual or temporal, the right style, by which they were denominated and distinguished, was not used: *in all these, and* MANY OTHER CASES, *the letters patents were liable to be disputed and set aside.* This rendered *all possessions very precarious; and there were few gentlemen in the kingdom, but had been, some time or other, questioned for their title, or disturbed in the enjoyment of their estates.* The inconveniences whereof were very visible, in the discouragement of husbandry (few persons caring to improve lands which they cannot call their own) and *in the general dissatisfaction of the people.*"[230]

[230] Carte, I. 60.

to the reformation, at those of the successive swarms of needy English adventurers, who migrated thither for the purpose of repairing their shattered fortunes,—and, subsequent to the reformation, the Roman Catholics at the feet of the miserable oligarchy styling itself "*the Protestant ascendency;*" what can be the result of such a state of things, but that the favoured cast will be base, corrupt, unjust, and tyrannical; and violate, as they generally may with impunity, every law of God and man, to the oppression of the degraded cast? and that the latter forlorn description will be abject, timid, crouching, and forced to submit to every indignity, insult, and depredation,* or, if they resist, be crushed, with added weight, to their previous sufferings.

* Among the grievances which are so pathetically enumerated in the Remonstrance of the Catholics of Ireland, agreed upon, March 17, 1642, the following is applicable to the subject of the present chapter, and is confirmed by the preceding extract from Leland: "The procuring of false inquisitions upon feigned titles of their estates, against *many hundred years' possession*, and no traverse or petition of right admitted thereunto, and *jurors, denying to find such offices, were censured even to public infamy and ruin of their estates;* the finding thereof being against their consciences and their evidences: and nothing must stand against such offices taken of great and considerable parts of the kingdom, but letters patents under the great seal: and if letters patents were produced, (as in most cases they were) none must be allowed valid, nor yet sought to be legally avoided: so that of late times, by the underhand working of Sir William Parsons, knight, now one of the lords justices here, and the arbitrary illegal power of the two impeached judges in Parliament, and others drawn in by

Such was the hideous picture exhibited in Ireland, during that period, which the world, deluded by dishonest writers, of great but undeserved celebrity, has been universally led to regard as "*a blessed condition of peace and security.*"

The great extent of the last chapters precludes the necessity of being prolix with the present one. I shall therefore be as brief as possible, and reduce it within narrow bounds.

The land was covered with hosts of pimps, spies, and informers, whose eternal employment was finding flaws in the titles of gentlemen's estates, and, if possible, ejecting them, in which they were constantly countenanced by government; or, if they failed in this part of the project, forcing them to ruinous compositions.

"*Needy projectors and rapacious courtiers still continued the scandalous traffic of pleading the king's title against the possessors of estates, of seizing their lands, or forcing them to grievous compositions.*"[231]

We have asserted that this system of rapine was more oppressive than that of James. A moment's reflection will satisfy every reader on this point. That miserable king only spoliated a twentieth part of the island; whereas the

their advice and council, *one hundred and fifty letters patents were avoided in one morning;* which course continued until all the patents of the kingdom, to a few, were by them and their associates declared void."[232]

[231] Leland, III. 15. [232] Carte, III. 137.

informers harassed, tricked, and preyed upon the inhabitants of the remaining nineteen-twentieths. In the preceding note, page 225, Carte expressly informs us, that "there were few gentlemen in the kingdom, who had not been, some time or other, questioned for their title, or disturbed in the possession of their estates."

"They who were too poor or too spiritless to engage in distant adventures, *courted fortune in Ireland.* Under pretence of improving the king's revenue in a country where it was far less than the charge of government, they obtained *commissions of inquiry into defective titles*, and grants of *concealed lands and rents* belonging to the crown; the great benefit of which was generally to accrue to the projector, whilst the king had but an inconsiderable proportion of the concealment, or a small advance of rent. DISCOVERERS WERE EVERY WHERE BUSILY EMPLOYED IN FINDING OUT FLAWS IN MEN'S TITLES TO THEIR ESTATES. The old pipe-rolls were searched, to find the original rents with which they had been charged. The patent rolls, in the tower of London, were ransacked for the ancient grants. *No means of industry*, or DEVICES, *were left untried, to force the possessors to accept of new grants, at an advanced rent.* In general, men were either conscious of the defects in their titles, or *alarmed at the trouble and expense of a contest with the crown*, or *fearful of the issue of such a contest*, at a time, and in a country, where the prerogative was highly strained, and strenuously supported by the judges. These inquiries, therefore, commonly ended in a new composition, made at as cheap a rate, and as easy an advance of rent, as the possessors could obtain."[233]

Can the history of the world produce, in a state of peace, such a hideous order of things as is here detailed? An entire nation divided into two classes, plunderers and plundered,—spies

[233] Leland, II. 549.

and informers, and victims of their malice and avarice! What scenes of distress and wretchedness, what instances of rapine, what fraud, what trick, what chicane, what forgery, what perjury, must have taken place in such a state of society, when the baleful race of informers and "*discoverers were every where busily employed in finding out flaws in men's titles to their estates!*" And this in lord Clarendon's millenium! that "blessed condition of peace and security," when "whatsoever their land, labour, or industry produced, was their own!"

Fastidious readers will murmur at the constant repetition of the development of the falsehood of lord Clarendon, which occurs in this work. But what is to be done in such a case? If fraud, falsehood, and imposture, every step we take, cross our path, must we pass them over unnoticed, from deference to that fastidiousness, which, while it submits cheerfully to the eternal repetition of falsehood, affects to be shocked at the repetition of its detection?

## CHAPTER XI.

*Slanders of the Irish character. Honourable testimonials. Baron Finglass. Sir Edward Coke. Sir John Davies. Highland missionaries to civilize the Irish. Project of Irish plantations in England and Scotland.*

TO palliate, or even to justify, these spoliations, the Irish of that era are represented as rude, barbarous, savage, and intolerant of law and order. Were this statement correct, it would by no means justify the proceedings which we have here detailed. There is no law, human or divine, which warrants a civilized man in seizing the possessions of him who is, or whom he pretends to be, uncivilized. Any law that would have warranted James, in his conduct to his Ulster and Leinster subjects, warranted Cortes, Pizarro, and Almagro, in their lawless devastations in Mexico and Peru. Indeed the Spaniards may be more readily defended than James. The wretched Mexicans and Peruvians had no claim on the protection of their invaders: they were despoiled by a host of armed banditti, after a regular warfare. But the ill-fated Irish were plundered and made a prey of by a prince whose paramount duty was, not only not to depredate

on them himself, but to protect them from the depredations of others.

But here we meet the slanderers, who give such hideous accounts of the Irish, on the very threshold; and are able to stamp on their foreheads the seal of falsehood in the most legible characters. The evidence we produce is such as no man living will dare dispute. It is not derived from O'Sullivan, O'Connor, O'Halloran, or Curry. To these writers, objections of partiality would be made, by those prejudiced men who delight in every thing, however gross, however unjust, that defames or destroys the Irish character. We appeal to Patrick Finglass, Esq. chief baron of the exchequer, under Henry VIII. to Coke, the author of the Institutes, and to that John Davies, king James's attorney-general in Ireland, who brought the accusation against the inhabitants of Ulster, of "*not building houses nor planting orchards*," to prove that they had no lands of inheritance.

Baron Finglass places the Irish character on far higher ground than that of the English, so far as respects submission to law and justice:

"It is a great abusion and reproach, that the laws and statuts made in this lond are not observed ne kept, after the making of theme, eight days; which matter is oone of the distructions of Englishmen of this lond: and *divers Irishmen doth observe and kepe such laws and statuts, which they make upon hills in their country, firm and stable, without breaking them for any favour or reward.*"[234]

[234] Hibernica, 101.

Edward Coke delivers his opinion of the Irish, in a high and encomiastic style of commendation:

"I have been informed by many of those that have had judicial places there, and [know] partly of my own knowledge, that THERE IS NO NATION OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD THAT ARE GREATER LOVERS OF JUSTICE than they are; *which virtue must of course be accompanied by many others*."[235]

In portraying the Irish character, Sir John Davies has displayed more talent and candour than are to be found in his forensic development of the rights of inheritance.

"They will gladly continue in this condition of subjects, without defection, or adhering to any other lord or king, *as long as they may be protected and justly governed, without oppression on the one side, or impunity on the other*. For THERE IS NO PEOPLE UNDER THE SUN THAT DOTH LOVE EQUAL AND INDIFFERENT JUSTICE BETTER THAN THE IRISH; *or will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof*, although it be against themselves; *so that they may have the protection and benefit of the law, when upon just cause they do desire it*."[236]

"I dare affirm, that in the space of five years last past, there have not been found so many malefactors worthy of death, in all the six circuits of this realm, which is now divided into thirty-two shires at large, as in one circuit of six shires, namely, the western circuit in England. For the truth is, that, in time of peace, THE IRISH ARE MORE FEARFUL TO OFFEND THE LAW THAN THE ENGLISH, *or any other nation whatsoever*."[237]

Yet this is the nation which the miserable herd of scribblers who have undertaken its history, have stigmatized as barbarous, savage, and wild;

[235] Coke, IV. 349. [236] Davies, 213. [237] Idem, 200.

and who were to be civilized by plantations of the polished and refined Highlanders, for whom their countryman James despoiled the Irish of their estates. The idea of bringing the wild and savage Highlanders into Ireland, to tame and civilize a nation, of which the agent of their despoiler bore this exalted testimony, that "no people under the sun did love equal and indifferent justice better," is almost as romantic as it would be to bring a party of the refined inhabitants of the Alleghany mountains, to teach our beaux and belles to dance cotillions and minuets.

The character drawn by these writers, is true or false. But it cannot be false: for no rational man could for a moment suppose that these three great public officers of the crown of England could conspire in uttering falsehoods to flatter the Irish, the Helots of England: and if it be true, as it must be, then is it clear that it would have been full as correct and as wise, perhaps more so, to make a plantation of Irish in Scotland or England, to civilize those nations, as to introduce the Scotch or English into Ireland, for the same benevolent purpose. These nations, at that period, carried on their border wars with a ruthless and infernal ferocity, barbarity, and desolation, that will stand a comparison with the so-much-detested ravages of the Huns, Goths, and Vandals. Fire and sword cleared their path of every thing, animate or inanimate, that fell in their way. Neither age, sex, nor condition

escaped. To remove all doubt on the subject, I submit a specimen of a five days' inroad into Scotland, by the earl of Sussex, about thirty years previous to the *famous northern plantation.*

"*A Note of a Journey into Tividale, by the earl of Sussex, her majesty's lieutenant in the north, begun the* 17*th of April,* 1570, *and ending the* 22*d of the same.*

"The 17th of April, 1570, the earl of Sussex and the lord Hunsdon, governor of Berwick, with all the garrisons and power of the east marches, came to Warke, and entered into Tividale, in Scotland, the 18th, at the break of day, and *burnt all the castles and towns as they went*, until they came to the castle of Moss, standing in a strong marsh, and belonging to the lord of Fernhurst, *which they burnt and razed, and so burnt the country until they came to Craling.*

"The same day, Sir John Foster, with all the garrisons and force of the middle marches, entered into Tividale and Expesgate Head, sixteen miles from Warke, and *so burnt all the country, until they came to a strong castle*, in the possession of the mother of lord Fernhurst, *which he burnt and razed; and so burnt all the other castles and towns*, until he came to Craling, where both companies met, and so went up the river of Tivit, *and burnt and threw down all the castles and towns upon the river*, until they came to Jedworth, where they lodged this day.

"The 19th, the army was divided into two parts, whereof the one did pass the river of Tivit, and *burnt and razed the castle of Fernhurst, Hunthill, and Bederoll*, and passed on to Minte: and *the other part of the army burnt in like sort on the other side of the river Tivit*, until he came to Hawick.

"The 20th, the army went to Branshaw, the lord of Bucklough's house, which was wholly overthrown with powder; and then divided and *burnt, on the north of the river of Tivit, more into the inland, all the castles and towns in that country.*

"The 21st, the army was divided, and one part went to the river of Bowbeat, and *burnt all on both sides of that river*, and the other part went to the river of Caile, and *burnt all on both*

*sides of this river;* ALL WHICH TIME THERE WAS NEVER ANY SHOW OF RESISTANCE.

"And it is conceived by such as know the enemy's part of Tividale, that there are *razed, overthrown, and burnt,* in this journey, ABOVE FIFTY STRONG CASTLES AND PILES, AND ABOVE THREE HUNDRED VILLAGES."[238]

It may be fairly questioned, whether a band of demons, escaped from the regions of Lucifer, could, with their wonted activity, in five days, have perpetrated more devastation than my lord Sussex and his garrisons had the pleasure of accomplishing, upon the *unresisting* Scotchmen, in that space of time. The merit is enhanced tenfold, by the circumstance that it was executed on an *unresisting* enemy; and this forms the proudest wreath of the laurel crown that entwined the brow of the mighty hero! He ran no risk of his own precious life, nor of those of his merciful and heroic followers. To spare the lives of his soldiers, is the first duty of a general. That nothing in human form ever exceeded the horrors of this exploit, within the time it occupied, cannot be doubted. *Fifty castles and three hundred villages consumed in five days!* Illustrious achievement! Attila or Genghis Khan might have studied the art of desolation to advantage, under my lord Sussex. With what propriety or decency writers belonging to that nation dare to stigmatize the cotemporaneous Irish as savages and

[238] Cabala, 174.

barbarians, let the world judge. And be it observed, that my lord Scroope made as pleasant an inroad beyond the borders, in a different direction, at the same time; and equally signalized his humanity, and his taste for bonfires.* With similar exploits of this polished and humane nation, to which Ireland stands so much indebted for her civilization, we could fill a dozen chapters for the edification of the reader: but we presume it can hardly be necessary. Let us, however, without offence, offer a gentle hint to Englishmen, and more especially to their writers, that whenever the subject of savages and barbarians is started, it would not be improper to bear in mind the homely, but instructive proverb, "*Men of glass, throw no stones.*" To this lesson, hardly one of them ever pays due attention.

* "*The Rode of the lord Scroope, warden of the west marches of England, into Scotland.*

"Who, the 17th of April, at ten of the clock at night, with three thousand horse and foot, came to Ellesingham, on the Wednesday at night, and *burned that town* in the morning, being from Carlisle twenty miles. On Thursday, he *burned besides Hoddam*, the Maymes, the town, and all the houses, which is the lord Herryes'; that day they *burned Trayletrow*, which is the lord Maxwell's; *they burned the town of Reywell*, which is the lord Copland's and the lord Homeyne's. They *burned* the house of Copewell, and the demesne of the lord Copland's. They *burned the town of Blackshieve*, which is the lord Maxwell's; item, *the town of Sherrington*, of the same; item, *the town of Lowzwood*, of the same lord's."[239]

[239] Cabala, 175.

The barbarity of English warfare, about that period, was very impartially dealt out to other nations besides the Scotch and Irish, who had no particular preference. The French* and Spaniards† were under equal obligations.

* "Twenty days together did the lord Talbot, *with fire and sword*, pass through Picardy and Artois, *destroying all that stood in his way*, and so returneth UNENCOUNTERED."[240]

† The English, in their invasion of Spain, in the year 1566, committed such scenes of havoc and destruction, as would have become a horde of Scythians. "*The town* [Cadiz] *they burnt*, saving only the churches. The walls they battered, and towers demolished. *The island itself they burned, razed, and spoiled*, LAYING ALL WASTE BEFORE THEM, *and leaving the rubbish to declare the ruins which the English had made*."[241]

The army "coming to Vigo, found every street fenced with a strong barricado, and but only one man in the town; the inhabitants making towards Bayon, as fast as they could drive. Then WAS BOTH THE TOWN, AND ALL THE COUNTRY FOR SEVEN MILES COMPASS, SET ON A FLAME."[242] This was the polished, refined, and humane nation, that was to civilize the Irish, whom Leland veraciously styles "*savages:*" but, so far as respected warfare, the English were themselves plunged in the most savage barbarism, as a perusal of their own writers will fully evince.

[240] Daniel, II. 140. [241] Speed, 1198. [242] Idem, 1191.

## CHAPTER XII.

*Representation in Parliament. Fraud, venality, and corruption of the executive, legislative, and judiciary. Rotten boroughs. Record of infamy, on the Journals of the House of Commons.*

WE have fully established the non-existence of lord Clarendon's golden age, under three great aspects,—freedom of religion, security of person, and security of property. We have proved it as fraudulent and false, as fraud and falsehood ever conspired to make any portrait. The fourth general head remains,—a fair representation in Parliament. To this we invite the reader's attention.

Under a free and independent Parliament, Ireland could not possibly have suffered the tithe of the oppressions of which the reader has had an indistinct bird's-eye view; but which, at full length, would fill folio volumes. There have been countries as much oppressed as Ireland; and tyrants as fell, and as fierce, and as rapacious as the deputies that swayed the sceptre there. But we know of no part of Europe that has experienced, for the same length of time, that is, for six hundred years, so grinding and hideous a despotism.

In a Parliament correctly constituted, the interests of the representatives would have been so completely identified with those of their constituents, that it would have been impossible to have subjected the exercise of the national religion to pains and penalties, at the will, as we have already said, of a paltry minority of two-thirteenths of the nation, at most; or to have enacted any of those barbarous statutes which rendered the legislation of Ireland, for centuries, an object of abhorrence and detestation.

We shall consider the subject of representation under four different heads:

I. The periods of the meeting of Parliament;

II. The modes of election;

III. The manner of framing laws; and

IV. The freedom of debate.

And it cannot fail to appear, that, in this respect, Ireland was as flagrantly oppressed, as we have seen under the preceding heads.

### I. *Periods of Meeting.*

From the twenty-ninth year of Elizabeth, anno 1587, to the fifteenth of Charles I. anno 1639, embracing a period of fifty-two years, there were but two Parliaments held in Ireland;—one in 1613, under James I.; and the other in 1634-5, under Charles I.[243] Thus were the powers of legislation wholly suspended, in one instance, for twenty-six, and in another for twenty-one

[243] Mountmorres, II. 175.

years. The legislative functions, in the mean time, were usurped and abused by the executive officers, who passed acts of state, which had all the efficacy of acts of Parliament, and were enforced by fine and imprisonment, as we have already shown.

From 1666 to 1692, there was another intermission of Parliaments in Ireland.* It thus appears, that out of a period of a little more than a century, there were above seventy years in which no Parliament was held. If, however, regard be had to the mode in which the elections for the Lower House were conducted, as shall be shown presently; to the kind of men who were returned; and to the complexion of a large portion of the laws they enacted, the intermission can hardly be considered as an evil. But to be freed from the abomination of a corrupt legislature, affords no proof of the non-existence of the enormous injustice resulting from the deprivation, for so long a period, of a fair and honest representation.

II. *Modes of the election of members of the House of Commons.*

On the original adjustment of representation in a legislative or deliberative body, it is fair to presume, on every principle of honour and ho-

* "The fatal dissolution [took place] the 7th of August, 1666. This event was emphatically fatal, because it did not legally assemble, from this latter period, in Ireland, till 1692."[244]

[244] Mountmorres, II. 176.

nesty, that there ought to be a reasonable proportion observed between the constituents and their representatives. If a town with three thousand inhabitants has two representatives, one with six thousand ought to have four. These proportions, however, will be materially changed by time. One place will rise into consequence from a state of obscurity, and another sink from a state of eminence to obscurity; and justice requires that the representation should be occasionally modified accordingly. But so many persons are interested in the support of abuses, and those who are thus interested act so much in concert, that reformation is at all times extremely difficult: and we believe that in no country but the United States, and perhaps France, in some of the scores of constitutions which "fretted their short hour on the stage," during the French revolution, has there ever been provision made for periodical regulation of representation by census. Hence the borough system in England has gradually become the scourge of that nation, and the astonishment and disgust of the rest of the world.

But the representation in Ireland had, in its origin, all the leprosy and ulceration which time has introduced, in a succession of ages, into that of England. To expose its hideous deformity naked to the eye of the reader, and to convince him that in every part of the government of that beloved, but thrice-wretched country, Ireland,

where I first drew my breath, and whose awful fate wrings my heart with distress, while I feebly sketch its wrongs, there was a systematic outrage on every principle of honour, honesty, and justice, I shall give him a view of the mode in which the elections were managed in three Parliaments: the two first in 1560 and 1568, under the "Virgin Queen," *(lucus a non lucendo)* and the third in 1613, under the wise, unassuming, profound, and thrice-puissant prince, James I. the mirror and quintessence of perfection.

In the first Parliament held under Elizabeth, the base means resorted to, for the purpose of securing a majority, were of a unique character, without previous precedent, or subsequent example. Writs were issued to only ten of the nineteen counties then under the British government; and thus the remaining nine were disfranchised. The Parliament was composed of seventy-six members, of whom fifty-six were for towns and boroughs *where the royal authority predominated*:* the remaining twenty were for the

* "In the House of Commons, we find representatives summoned for ten counties only. The rest, which made up the number seventy-six, were citizens and burgesses of those towns in which the royal authority was predominant. It is therefore little wonder, that, in spite of clamour and opposition, in a session of a few weeks, the whole ecclesiastical system of queen Mary was entirely reversed by a series of statutes, conformable to those already enacted in the English Parliament."[245]

[245] Leland, II. 272.

counties of Dublin, Meath, Westmeath, Louth, Kildare, Catherlow, Kilkenny, Waterford, Tipperary, and Wexford. Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Cavan, Clare, Antrim, Ardee, Down, and King's and Queen's counties, containing probably half of the entire population of the kingdom, were wholly unrepresented, and of course disfranchised. It was in this Parliament, and by such vile fraud, that the oppressive penal code against the Roman Catholics was enacted.

On this atrocious affair, it would be superfluous to comment. Lives there a man, with a spark of honour or justice in his composition, however hostile to Ireland or Irishmen, however bigotedly devoted to England, that will not pronounce it infamous?

In the Parliament held in 1568, the election was conducted with most manifest injustice. To pass over minor enormities, and condense the frauds into the narrowest compass possible, we shall confine ourselves to three species of flagrant crimes:

I. Many persons were returned for places not incorporated, and which of course had no right to representation;

II. In several of the places entitled to send representatives, the sheriffs and mayors returned themselves;

III. A swarm of Englishmen were returned for places which some of them knew not, and of

which none of them were residents, although residence was, by law, an essential requisite in a representative.

In consequence of these frauds, the administration had a considerable majority; and elected Mr. Stanihurst, recorder of Dublin, their speaker, although Sir Christopher Barnwell had a large majority of the votes of the real members, those who were duly elected. For a considerable time, the latter disputed the validity of the votes of the intruding impostors, which gave rise to the utmost disorder, and contests that would have better suited with a bear-garden than a Parliament.* Hooker, one of the impudent intruders, has left on record the most circumstantial account of the affair that is to be found; and, as the leader of the usurpers, endeavours to throw the whole guilt of the dishonourable proceeding on the members duly returned.† But it is impossible

* "And in this matter they showed themselves very forward, and so unquiet that it was more like a bear-baiting of disorderly persons, than a Parliament of wise and grave men."[246]

"Their dealings then were altogether disordered, being more like a bear-baiting of loose persons, than an assembly of wise and grave men in parliament."[247]

† "The next day following, being Friday, the lower house met; and, contrary to the order of that house, and duty of that company, instead of unity, there began a disunion; and for concord, discord was received. For all, or the most part

[246] Hollinshed, VI. 344. [247] Idem, 345.

to read even his account, varnished as it is with false glosses, without being satisfied that the crime rested on him and his accomplices. As well might a band of ruffians or burglars, forcing themselves into a man's house, with a view to robbery or murder, charge the owner, who endeavoured to save himself, his family and property, with the crime of the affray, and its consequences, if bloodshed ensued, as a riotous rabble of strangers, who, in violation not merely of honour and justice, but of the express law of the land, had polluted the sanctuary of legislation by a forcible entry, could make the legal representatives of the nation responsible for their crime.

of the knights and burgesses of the English Pale, especially they who dwelled within the counties of Meath and Dublin, who, *seeing a great number of Englishmen to have place in that house*, began to except against that assembly as not good, nor warranted by law. Their avantparler was Sir Christopher Barnwell, knight; who being somewhat learned, his credit was so much the more, and by them thought meetest and worthy to have been the speaker of that house: and he, being the spokesman, alleged three special causes, why he and his complices would not yield their consents.

"The first was, because that there were certain burgesses *returned for sundry towns which were not corporate, and had no voice in the Parliament.*

"The second was, that *certain sheriffs, and certain mayors of towns corporate, had returned themselves.*

"The third and chiefest was, that a number of Englishmen were returned to be burgesses of *such towns and corporations as which some of them never knew, and none at all were residing and dwelling in the same, according as by the law is required.*"[248]

[248] Hollinshed, VI. 342.

The business of the legislature being impeded by these furious contests, it was agreed to refer the matter in dispute to the judges. This afforded but a miserable chance of redress for the Irish nation, as these functionaries were removable at the pleasure of the crown, and of course subservient to its views. However, the profligacy of the proceedings was fully established; for the judges, corrupt and biassed as they were, admitted the existence of the three enormous species of offence alleged by the minority.* They decided that two of the classes of usurpers should be expelled the Parliament,—

I. Those who were returned for towns not incorporated;

II. Those magistrates who had returned themselves.

But they profligately gave their opinion, that those who were returned for towns where they

* The judges, having "discoursed and conferred of this matter, returned their answers; that concerning the first and second exceptions, that the burgesses returned from towns not corporate, and for such sheriffs, mayors, and sovereigns, as have returned themselves, shall be dismissed out of the same; but as for such others as the sheriffs and mayors had returned, *they should remain, and the penalty to rest upon the sheriffs for their wrong returns*."[249]

"The same was so stomached, that the *placing of the Englishmen, to be knights and burgesses*, could not be digested, as did appear in the sequel of that assembly, where every bill furthered by the English gentlemen, was stopped and hindered by them."[250]

[249] Hollinshed, VI. 348. [250] Ibid.

did not reside, should retain their seats; and that the penalty of the false, illegal returns should be paid by the sheriffs.

The third class being more numerous than the other two, and being secured in their usurpation by this iniquitous decision, the government still possessed a majority; and was of course enabled to carry whatever measures it thought proper; and thus a few needy and dependent Englishmen, who probably had not an acre of land in the island, were virtually its legislators. Let us, however, do lord Clarendon the justice to state, that this dishonourable affair occurred previous to his millenium. His mistakes and falsehoods are sufficiently numerous, without unjustly increasing them.

What a shameful prostitution of the dignity of the bench! What an unanswerable proof that venality and corruption had spread throughout every department of the state, poisoned all the sources of justice, and that all were leagued in the grand work of oppressing the wretched Irish! A law, founded in reason, common sense, justice, and honesty, declared that every borough, or town, or city, should be represented by a resident, who would know its situation, feel its wants, plead its cause, rise with its prosperity, and sink with its fall. A horde of hungry Englishmen, in violation of the law, are returned to represent places they never saw: a profligate Parliament applies to a prostitute bench, to de-

cide the question whether a remedy shall be applied to this illegal proceeding: it decides that these intruders and usurpers shall maintain their seats, but that those who returned them shall pay the penalty of the infraction of the law! What a mockery! Suppose a fine of one hundred thousand pounds were laid on those officers, which would go into the treasury,—suppose they were imprisoned for life,—suppose they were hanged, drawn, and quartered; what compensation would be afforded to the towns robbed of their representation, or to the nation cheated with such a fraudulent legislature?

These proceedings, and the opinion of the judges, afford an ample field for consideration. They exhibit another feature of the hideous oppression which their rulers exercised over the ill-fated Irish. I have already more than once endeavoured to force these subjects on the minds of American readers, by applying the cases on this side of the Atlantic. Let us suppose that the sheriff of Philadelphia city, instead of allowing the citizens to vote for two members of congress, were to elect himself and his deputy; that Frankford, and Bustleton, and Holmesburg, and Chester, and Darby, and Marcus Hook, and Point-no-Point were to send each two members to congress; and, finally, that a host of newly-arrived citizens of Kentucky should be chosen to represent some of our towns or counties, which they had never seen. This "blessed condition of

peace and security" would make the "swords of our citizens leap from their scabbards," to avail myself of the heroics of my countryman Burke.

In the Parliament held anno 1613, under James I. the proceedings were at least as flagitious. The whole number of boroughs represented, previous to that period, was thirty; but for this Parliament, in order to secure an overwhelming majority, there were forty new boroughs created, every one of them in places where the government had decided influence, and nearly the whole in shabby, contemptible hamlets,* which had not the least claim to a representation.† The chief part of these boroughs were incorporated previous to issuing the writs for the election; but with a most hardened and profligate disregard of even the forms of justice, many of them

* "A number of new boroughs, most of them *inconsiderable*, and *many of them too poor to afford wages to their representatives*, must be entirely influenced by the government, and must return *its immediate creatures and dependents*. Such an accession of power could not fail to encourage the administration to act without reserve, and pursue the dictates of its passions and resentments."[251]

† The petition of the lords to king James, states the existence of "a fearful suspicion, that the project of erecting so many corporations *in places that can scantly pass the rank of the poorest villages in the poorest country in Christendom*, do tend to nought else, at this time, but that, by *the voices of a few, selected for the purpose*, extreme penal laws should be imposed upon your subjects here."[252]

[251] Leland, II. 519. [252] Idem, 521.

were incorporated after the writs had been issued.* Sir John Davies feebly attempts to palliate this outrage on justice ;† but with pretty much the same success as attended his elaborate vindication of the Ulster spoliation.

But, abandoned as was this system, it did not comprise one-half of the injustice or wickedness of the election. The same course was pursued as in the preceding Parliament. Many non-resident Englishmen were returned; some of the judges returned themselves; and a number of wretched *outlaws* completed the list of the members of that House of Commons which attainted Tyrone and Tyrconnel.

* "The deputy continued to *increase the new boroughs to the number of forty*, of which *several were not incorporated, until the writs for summoning a Parliament had already issued.*"[253]

† "His majesty hath *most graciously* and *justly* created divers new boroughs, in sundry parts of the kingdom."[254]

"Certainly the number of these new boroughs, compared with the counties that never had any burgesses before this time, doth carry a less proportion than the ancient boroughs, compared with the number of the ancient counties; for in those twelve or thirteen old shires, there are *thirty cities and boroughs*, at least, which send citizens and burgesses to the Parliament. Whereas, for seventeen counties at large, being more than half the shires of this kingdom, which had not one borough in them before this new erection, his majesty hath now lately erected BUT FORTY NEW BOROUGHS, or thereabouts, which, in the judgment of all indifferent men, must needs seem reasonable, just, and honourable."[255]

[253] Leland, II. 522. [254] Davies, 304. [255] Idem, 306.

To heighten the wickedness of the proceedings, in imitation of the vile example set under the "Virgin Queen," no writs were issued to sundry ancient boroughs, which, from their population and charters, were entitled to representatives.*

Notwithstanding all these shameless and abandoned frauds, the administration had not a large majority. Their usurping minions and parasites were only an hundred and twenty-five, and the opposition party were an hundred and one: there were six absent members, whose politics are not known.† It is easy to conceive what a decided majority the recusants would have had, but for the profligate disregard of every semblance of honour and justice, which, during the election, had governed the proceedings of the enemies of Irish happiness and prosperity.

In consequence of those enormous abuses, the real representatives of the nation were out-numbered; and this motley majority forced Sir John

* "It was asserted by them, in support of their opposition, that the sheriffs had sent *no writs to several of the boroughs;* that *from others, the returns would not be received;* that *most of the patents and charters of the new boroughs were dated after the commissions for the writs were issued.*[256]

† "Two hundred and thirty-two members had been returned: six were absent. Of the remainder, one hundred and twenty-five were Protestants; and one hundred and one formed the recusant party."[257]

[256] Crawford, I. 346. [257] Leland, II. 523.

Davies into the chair, as speaker, although Sir John Everard had a great majority of the legal votes.

The real representatives of the people made a struggle as ardent, but as ineffectual, as had taken place in 1568. They were baffled by the address, overcome by the power, and compelled to yield to the wicked views, of a most profligate government: and the true state of the proceedings is recorded in the Journals, in the following resolution, which is an open and undisguised confession of the infamy of the majority, and of the administration by whom they were supported:

"Nov. 19, 1613, It was resolved by the house of commons, That whereas some persons have been unduly elected, *some being judges*, *some for not being estated in their boroughs*, *some for being* OUTLAWED, *excommunicated;* and lastly, for being *returned for places whose charters were not valid;* it was resolved not to question them for the present, in order to prevent stopping public business; but this resolution was not to be drawn into precedent."[258]

"On the 24th November, 1614, the order of the last session was renewed, verbatim, relative to postponing inquiries into the returns of members, &c. who were disqualified, as judges, *as being outlawed, &c. or returned for places which had no charters.*"[259]

The lords and commons, seeing their rights thus daringly trampled under foot, the law of the land shamefully violated, and the legislation of the nation virtually thrown into the hands of a greedy and devouring horde of strangers, sent

[258] Mountmorres, I. 169. [259] Idem, 173.

commissioners to the court of king James, to petition him for redress: but they were treated with insult and outrage. Two of them were, under some frivolous pretence, thrown into prison,* for alleged insolence of conduct; the case was referred to the British Privy Council;† and they were dismissed with an impertinent, frothy, bombastic speech from the royal pedant, full of verbiage that would have disgraced a school-boy.

The discussion of such wickedness cannot fail to be to the last degree painful to the reader, as it is to the writer. It harasses and tears the feelings with violence. What a hideous prostitution of every thing honest, fair, just, or correct, it would be, were the governors of New York and Pennsylvania, for the purpose of overwhelming the vote of the capitals of these two states, to incorporate, in the one instance, Chesnuthill and Logtown, and, in the other, Bergen and Flatbush, and allow each of these places an equal number

* "It seemed no auspicious incident to the Irish agents, that Talbot and Luttrel, for some late or present insolence of conduct, *were committed prisoners*, one to the tower, the other to the fleet."[260]

† "In flagrant violation of the rights of the Irish Parliament, he referred the final determination of it to the English Privy Council. Their decision was, that several of the returns were illegal."[261]

"The members returned from those *boroughs which were created* AFTER THE WRITS HAD BEEN ALREADY ISSUED, were, *for the present*, declared incapable of sitting."[262]

[260] Leland, II. 529. [261] Crawford, I. 346.
[262] Leland, II. 531.

of representatives with the respective capitals, thus enabling Chesnuthill and Logtown, by a majority of two to one, to outvote Philadelphia, and making the same distribution in New York!

There is something so wicked in this procedure, such a mockery of even the slightest shadow of justice, that it excites loathing and abhorrence. The idea of elevating the political balance, and throwing Dublin, Waterford, Cork, and Galway into one scale, and Glassnevin, the Black-rock, Clontarf, Dunleary, and Donnybrook, or any places equally insignificant, into the other, and suffering those five hamlets, with perhaps an hundred inhabitants, to outnumber the votes of four great cities, and of course to make laws to bind the estates of the natives, and subject them to pains and penalties for the worship of God, is inexpressibly wicked. This was, however, the precise state of the representation of Ireland, during lord Clarendon's millenium, and from the time of the Conquest, as it has been styled.

### III. *House of Lords.*

Against the corruption and profligacy of the House of Commons, the House of Lords might have afforded some security: but here the wicked arts of the government triumphed, and equally trampled under foot every principle of honour, honesty, and justice. In every potion, calculated to heal the wounds or alleviate the distresses of Ireland, there was always infused a deleterious

drug, whose admixture transformed it into poison. To secure a majority in the Upper House, Irish titles were granted to English noblemen, destitute of a single acre of land in Ireland.* They never appeared in Parliament; but confided their proxies to the minions of the government,—three, four, or five to one peer:

> "*Twenty-nine proxies were entered, four and five to one lord;* which was a scheme of lord Strafford's. But this abuse was soon afterwards corrected, by a standing order, that no more than two should be given to one lord."[263]

Thus six of these men of straw, not owning together a single farm, could out-vote the duke of Ormond, and the earls of Kildare, Castlehaven, Clanrickarde, and Fingal, who, united, possessed probably above a million!

## IV. *Freedom of Debate.*

But all these wise and salutary precautions to guard against the "*insolence of the recusants,*" were not deemed sufficient. If the members at any time dared to use the privilege of debate so as to offend the deputy or Privy Council, there were ready and adequate means of bringing them to their senses. There were very conve-

* "The principal grievances were concerning *proxies for those peers who had no estates in Ireland,*" &c.[264]

"The subsequent order contains a representation to his majesty, that *peers not estated in Ireland should not be allowed to vote.*"[265]

[263] Mountmorres, I. 321. [264] Idem, 344. [265] Idem, 343.

nient apartments in the jail, for their accommodation; and a few weeks' solitary confinement was an excellent specific for teaching them politeness:

"The same day, [Nov. 4, 1634] the lord deputy Wentworth communicated an act of council, for CONFINING AND IMPRISONING SIR JOHN DUNGAN AND CAPTAIN CHARLES PRICE, FOR WORDS SPOKEN IN PARLIAMENT!"[266]

On another occasion, a member of the House of Commons, who had a seat in the Privy Council, and who dared to vote against the dictum of the bashaw Wentworth, was punished by being expelled from the Council-Board. This wholesome and "*apparent severity*," was admirably calculated, in terrorem, for any other members who might venture to take the same course:

Sir Piers Crosby, "in the second session of the late Parliament, *ventured to oppose some measures of administration.* The deputy reprimanded and accused him of a violation of his oath, in voting against bills to which he had assented in Council, and concurred in transmitting them. Crosby was sequestered from the Council-Board. He complained of the severity, by petition. *He desired license to repair to England.* IT WAS REFUSED."[267]

The reader will probably be startled at the fact of the refusal of license to repair to England. But such was the real state of the case. No man in public employment could leave the kingdom, even to repair to the court of the British monarch, without license obtained from his deputy,

[266] Mountmorres, II. 10. [267] Leland, III. 39.

which was never granted to characters obnoxious to him, who might seek an opportunity to expose his misdeeds.

The case of Sir Piers is strong and striking. His standing in society was high; as he was a soldier of distinguished merit, and had acquired great reputation in the expedition to the coast of France, where he had been the principal means of preserving the English army in their retreat.[268] His sole offence, as above stated, was voting against an act proposed by the Privy Council. If the merits of such a man could not secure him from the degradation inflicted merely for the independent discharge of his duty as a member of the legislature, it is easy to conceive the slavish and abject state in which those members were generally held, who had no such claims to attention as belonged to the knight. His removal from the Privy Council Board took place by the express direction of the king, on the representation of Wentworth.*

This is a strong instance, in addition to those already given, of the fixed determination of the "*royal martyr*" to uphold his worthy representative, in all his flagitious proceedings. He thereby rendered himself amenable, in the eye of the Eternal and Just God, for all the long course of

* "On the representations of Wentworth, his majesty directed him to be *removed from the Privy Council*."[269]

[268] Leland, III. 39. [269] Ibid.

oppression, injustice, fraud, rapine, and violence, perpetrated by his minister, who, in his persecution of lord Mountnorris, lord Ely, lord St. Albans, Piers Crosby, and others, as well as in his Connaught spoliation, violated every rule of honour, justice, and humanity. Charles not only did not discountenance any even of his worst proceedings, but absolutely encouraged him in them. After all his enormities were perpetrated, Wentworth went to London, presented himself at court, and entered into a full detail of the whole course of conduct he had pursued. The unfeeling monarch expressed the most decided approbation:

> "His majesty interrupted me, and said this was no severity; wished me to go on in that way; for if I served him otherways, I should not serve him as he expected from me.
>
> "His majesty was pleased to express his approbation of all I had done; and their lordships to advise I should go on in a work so well begun; and that it must be acknowledged that the best service had been done this crown in Ireland. So I kneeled down, and kissed the king's hand, and the council rose."[270]

The tyranny of the deputy, and the slavery of the legislature, were observable in every part of their proceedings. Not to exhaust the patience of the reader, we shall close with one more instance. Wentworth had, by the most outrageous injustice, succeeded in carrying the election, in Dublin, in favour of the recorder of the city, one Cateline, who, the deputy was determined, should

[270] Carte, III. 11.

be chosen speaker of the House of Commons. Understanding that the members of that House contemplated choosing some other person, the insolent satrap was quite exasperated; and despatched the chancellor to them, with a mandate menacing his displeasure, if they should choose as speaker any other than the person "recommended by his majesty's Privy Council," which, at all events, would be utterly in vain, as "the conclusion must be according to his majesty's good will and pleasure."* His arbitrary power, imperious temper, and unrelenting disposition, were too well known, and the awe felt for him was too great, to admit of hesitation. His sovereign will and pleasure were therefore as completely the law in this instance, as the dictum of the emperor of Morocco in his capital.

* "And as I understood there was a muttering among them of rejecting him, and choosing some other for themselves, I called the lord chancellor to me, and directed him to require them forthwith to assemble themselves in their house, and to choose their speaker, who was to be presented to me by nine o'clock the next morning; telling them *it was not worth their contention*, and that it would be taken as an ill presage of some waywardness or frowardness of mind, *if they should go about to deny such for their speaker, as should be recommended by his majesty's Privy Council;* or to struggle in a business wherein the *conclusion of it must be according to his majesty's good will and pleasure*, whether they will or no. So they departed; and before dinner, without any noise or opposition at all, they chose the recorder for their speaker."[271]

[271] Strafford, apud Curry, I. 127.

### V. *Mode of framing laws.*

In this respect, as in every other in which we have viewed the case of unfortunate Ireland, her situation was to the last degree slavish, and the tyranny of England intolerable.

In a venal and corrupt Parliament, packed in the same manner as those three Parliaments, held in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, which we have mentioned, Sir Edward Poynings, then deputy, had a law passed which wholly destroyed the legislative power in Ireland; reduced her Parliament nearly to a level with a bed of justice in France; limited its operations to the mere enregisterment or rejection of edicts; and left it but a bare negative power of rejecting,* not of proposing, any law.†

* "A set of statutes were enacted, in the 10th Henry VII. (Sir Edward Poynings being then lord deputy, from whence they were called Poynings' laws) which restrained the power, as well of the deputy, as of the Parliament: and in time there was nothing left to the Parliament of Ireland, but *a bare negative, or power of rejecting*, NOT OF PROPOSING, ANY LAW."[272]

† "This day [August 2, 1634] was remarkable for a dispute between the lords and the lord deputy, about the framing of acts; which right, by Poynings' law, he contended, was *in himself and the council only;* and *Parliament had only power to prefer a petition to them for that purpose:* and lord Strafford entered a memorable protest, upon this occasion, in the Journals."[273]

[272] Jacobs, III. 534. [273] Mountmorres, I. 323.

By another law, passed during the administration of the same satrap, all the laws previously existing in England, were, at one stroke, made of force within the kingdom of Ireland.*

And, subsequently to this period, Ireland, without a single representative in the British Parliament, was always subject to the operation of all the British statutes, in which she "was specially named or included under general words."[274]

If the experience of the world did not afford numberless instances to prove, that those nations, which are the most jealous assertors of their own liberties, are the most consummate tyrants over subordinate nations, it would be matter of astonishment that England, which, at various periods of her history, had lavished so much blood and treasure, in defence of her own rights and freedom, should have so uniformly violated every principle, not merely of liberty, but of justice, in her treatment of, and displayed such wanton tyranny towards, Ireland. The case of these two nations affords a most felicitous illustration of the judicious and profound remark of Hume, that it may be regarded as "a fixed maxim," that "though free governments have been commonly the most happy for those who partake of their

* "It was enacted, by another of Poynings' laws, that all acts of Parliament, before that time made in England, should be of force within the kingdom of Ireland."[275]

[274] Jacobs, III. 534. [275] Ibid.

freedom; yet ARE THEY THE MOST RUINOUS AND OPPRESSIVE TO THEIR PROVINCES."[276]

From Parliaments constituted in the manner we have detailed, few measures were to be hoped for, but what were fraught with destruction to the happiness of Ireland. Majorities were generally secured in both houses, whose interests were in direct hostility with the best interests of the nation: and, in consequence, a large portion of their legislation has been an almost invariable tissue of outrage upon every principle of political economy, honour, honesty, and good faith.

"The mere Irish were not only accounted aliens, but enemies, and altogether out of the protection of the law; so as IT WAS NO CAPITAL OFFENCE TO KILL THEM."[277]

"Our law did neither *protect his* [the Irishman's] *life*, *nor revenge his death*."[278]

"As long as they were out of the protection of the law, so as EVERY ENGLISHMAN MIGHT OPPRESS, SPOIL, AND KILL THEM, WITHOUT CONTROUL, *how was it possible they could be other than outlaws and enemies of the crown of England?* If the king *would not admit them to the condition of subjects*, how could they learn to obey him as their sovereign? When they might not converse or commerce with any civil man, nor *enter into any town or city*, *without peril of their lives*, whither should they fly but into the woods and mountains, and there live in a wild and barbarous manner?"[279]

Of the barbarous code of laws which disgraced the Irish Statute-Book, we shall notice a few.

[276] Hume's Essays, I. 47.
[277] Davies, 82.
[278] Idem, 84.
[279] Idem, 90.

By one law, marriage or fosterage with the natives was made treason,*—a law tending to render eternal the hostility, and spread wide the devastation and horrors of warfare, between the aboriginals and the English colonists,—a law, in a word, of the most dire and baleful tendency.

By a law made in the reign of Edward IV. it was enacted, that any Englishman, meeting an Irishman robbing, or *going to rob*, or *coming from robbing*, unless he had an Englishman in his company, might kill him, and *cut off his head*, WITHOUT TRIAL;† and, on bringing the head to

* "By divers heavy penalties, the English were forbidden *to marry*, *to foster*, *to make gossips with the Irish*, or *to have any commerce in their markets or fairs*: nay, there was a law made, no longer since than the 28th Henry VIII. that the English should not marry with any person of Irish blood, though he had gotten a charter of denization, unless he had done both homage and fealty to the king in the chancery, and were also bound by recognizance, with sureties, to continue a loyal subject. Whereby it is manifest, that such as had the government of Ireland, under the crown of England, did intend to make A PERPETUAL SEPARATION AND ENMITY between the English and the Irish, pretending, no doubt, that THE ENGLISH SHOULD, IN THE END, ROOT OUT THE IRISH."[280]

† "It shall be lawful to all manner of men that find any thieves robbing by day or by night, or *going or coming to rob or steal*, *in or out*, *going or coming*, having no faithful man of good name and fame in their company, in English apparel, upon any of the liege people of the king, *to take and kill them*, and TO CUT OFF THEIR HEADS, *without any impeach-*

[280] Davies, 86.

the portrief of the town, he was further authorized to levy "with his own hands," and those of his aiders in the murder, two pence for every plough land, one penny for every half plough land, as well as for every house and property worth forty shillings. This act did not merely legalize murder, but offered a premium for it; any Englishman might, at his pleasure, cut off the head of an Irishman, and declare that he *was going to rob*, or *coming from robbing:* which assertions it was impossible to disprove; and a man, going to, or coming from, church, might be murdered, on pretence that he was *going to rob*, or *coming from robbing.* The murderer could then levy contributions on the barony, as a remuneration for the slaughter; and, considering the deadly hostility between the two nations, and the slight importance attached to the life of an Irishman, it is far from improbable that hundreds of them were thus decapitated; and that the business of chopping off heads was made as

*ment of our sovereign lord the king*, his heirs, officers, or ministers, or of any others.

"And it shall be lawful to the bringer of the said head, and his aiders to the same, for *to distrain and levy by their own hands*, of every man having one plough land in the barony where the said thief was taken, two pence; and of every man having half a plough land, one penny; and of every man having one house, and goods to the value of forty shillings, one penny; and of every other cottier, having one house and smoke, one half-penny."[281]

[281] Statutes, 21.

regular a trade, and as profitable a means of subsistence, as in some countries is the employment of shooting wolves or bears.

By another law, any man found within the Pale, with the beard on the upper lip, which was the Irish custom, might be seized, with his goods, as an Irish enemy, and ransomed as such.*

By another, every man was rendered liable for the offences committed by his son.†

By another, five of the best men of every stirpe were obliged to deliver up all of their surname charged with offences, or *to answer for the offences themselves.* Of course, when criminals escaped, their namesakes, how innocent soever, underwent the penalty of their offences.‡

* "*No* manner of man, that will be taken for an Englishman, shall have *no* beard" [these two negatives are in the statute] "above his mouth; that is to say, shall have no hair upon his upper lip; so that the said upper lip shall be once at least shaven every fortnight; or of equal growth with the nether lip. And if any man be found among the English contrary hereunto, then it shall be lawful to every man to take them and their goods as Irish enemies, and to ransom them as such."[282]

† "Every man shall answer for the offence and ill-doing of his son, as he himself that did the trespass, offence, &c. ought to do."[283]

‡ "Five persons of the best of every stirpe or nation of the Irishry, and in the countries that be not yet shire grounds, and till they be shire grounds, shall be bound to bring in, to be justified by law, all idle persons of their surname which shall be charged with any offence; *or else satisfy, of their own proper goods, the hurts by them committed to the parties*

[282] Statutes, 5. [283] Idem, 14.

We shall close with a short notice of the preamble of an act, which assumes, as the ground of its enaction, such miserable legends as display a disregard of even the slightest appearance of common honesty. Their wickedness stares us in the face, with the most meretricious audacity. The act was passed by the Parliament held in the eleventh year of the reign of Elizabeth, which was called expressly for the purpose of attainting the person, and confiscating the immense estate, of Shane O'Neal, who, as we have seen in page 179, was "*rooted out, on the complaint of the nobility.*" The preamble enters into an elaborate attempt to prove that the whole island, and all its inhabitants, were the property of the kings of England! a most wonderful proof of the fidelity with which the Irish nation was represented in that corrupt and venal legislature. That England or Englishmen should advance such claims, on the fabulous histories of Gurmonds, and Belans, and munificent donations of an island not their own, is not very surprising: but what indignation must it excite, to have those claims recorded among the statutes enacted in the metropolis of Ireland, and by men pretending to be representatives of that kingdom! The proofs

*grieved;* and also yield to the queen's majesty, her heirs and successors, *such fines*, as by the lord deputy, governor or governors and council of this realm, *shall be assessed for their offences.*"[234]

[234] Statutes, 229.

offered would excite our merriment, did not profound astonishment at their injustice stifle the propensity to ridicule.

The two principal grounds were, that the progenitors of the Irish, who migrated from Spain, lived in a province called Biscan, "whereof Bayon was a member;" that king Gurmond, son to the noble king Belan, king of Great Britain, was lord of Bayon; and, as the "*Virgin Queen*" was a lineal descendant of king Gurmond, "THEREFORE,"—most wonderful logic!—"the Irishmen should be the king of England his people, and Ireland his land!"

But, not relying wholly on this strong title to the kingdom and the people, and lest there should be sceptics who would dare dispute the point, they adduce another proof, so powerful as to silence the controversy to the end of time. This corroboration rests on *the incontrovertible fact*, that as Heremon and Heberus were leading their followers from Spain, they met with the said renowned hero, king Gurmond, at the islands of the Orcades, which were then *in the route from Spain to Ireland;* but they are now removed a few leagues out of the course. On this knotty point of geography, it is not necessary to dilate: we therefore return to the mighty monarch Gurmond.

This illustrious hero, whose fame has spread throughout the habitable globe, was returning,

crowned with laurels, from a great victory obtained in Denmark. The Milesian chiefs, wearied out with their tedious pilgrimage, and panting after an asylum, where they might repose from their labours, made an humble supplication to the conqueror, to grant them some place to the west, wherein to settle themselves. This puissant prince, a mirror of humanity and benignity, had compassion on the wanderers; most graciously made them a present of the Emerald Isle, with all its appurtenances; and moreover kindly furnished guides, to direct them in their voyage thither. And therefore "they should and ought to be the king of England his men."

The migration of the Milesians to Ireland, is stated by O'Connor, one of the most learned antiquarians of the last century, to have taken place eleven hundred years before the Christian era: the act for the attainder of O'Neale was passed in 1583. Thus the claim was quite a recent one, not quite twenty-seven hundred years old!

The reader may perhaps imagine, that, to change the scene, we have taken a flight into the regions of fancy; and that all we have stated, respecting Gurmond, and Belan, and Biscan, and the Orcades, and Heberus, and Heremon, and the great victory in Denmark, and the magnificent present of Ireland, is mere rhodomontade.

But the annexed extract* from the preface to the act for the attainder of Shane O'Neal, will

* *Extract from "An Act for the attainder of Shane O'Neile, and the extinguishment of the name of O'Neile, and the entitling of the Queen's majesty, her heirs, and successours, to the country of Tyrone, and other countries and territories in Ulster.*

"And now, most deere sovereign ladie, least that any man which list not to seeke and learn the truth, might be ledd eyther of his owne fantasticall imagination, or by the sinister suggestion of others, to think that the sterne or lyne of the Oneyles should or ought, by prioritie of title, to hold and possess anie part of the dominion or territories of Ulster before your majestie, your heyres, and successours, we, your grace's said faithfull and obedient subjects, for avoyding of all such scruple, doubt, and erroneous conceit, doe intend here (pardon first craved of your majestie for our tedious boldness) to disclose unto your highness *your auncient and sundry strong authentique tytles*, conveyed farr beyonde the said lynage of the Oneyles and all other of the Irishrie to the dignitie, state, title and possesion of this your realm of Ireland.

"And therefore it may like your most excellent majestie to be advertized, that the auncient chronicles of this realm, written both in the Latine, English, and Irish tongues, alledged *sundry auncient tytles for the kings of England to this land of Ireland.* And first, that at the beginning, afore the comming of Irishmen into the said land, they were dwelling in a *province of Spain, the which is called Biscan, whereof Bayon was a member, and the chief citie.* And that, at the said Irishmen's comming into Ireland, one *king Gurmond*, sonne to the noble king Belan, king of Great Britaine, which now is called England, *was lord of Bayon*, as many of his successours were to the time of king Henry the second, first conqueror of this realm: and THEREFORE THE IRISHMEN SHOULD BE THE KING OF ENGLAND HIS PEOPLE, AND IRELAND HIS LAND!!

"Another title is, that at the same time that Irishmen came out of Biscay, as exhiled persons, in sixty ships, *they met with*

remove all doubt on the subject, and convince him we have been as sober and serious as John Bunyan, when writing the Pilgrim's Progress.

*the same king Gurmond* upon the sea, *at the ysles of Orcades*, then comming from Denmark with great victory. Their captains, called Heberus and Heremon, went to this king, and him tolde the cause of their comming out of Biscay, and him prayed, with great instance, that he would graunt unto them, *that they might inhabit some land in the west.* The king at the last, by advise of the councel, *granted them Ireland to inhabite*, and assigned unto them guides for the sea, to bring them thither: and THEREFORE THEY SHOULD AND OUGHT TO BE THE KING OF ENGLAND'S MEN!!

"Another title is, as the clerke Geraldus Cambrensis writeth at large the historie of the conquest of Ireland by king Henry the second, your famous progenitor, how Dermot Mac Morch, prince of Leinster, which is the first part of Ireland, being a tyrant or tyrants, banished, went over the sea into Normandie, in the parts of France, to the said king Henry; and him besely besought of succour, which he obtained, and thereupon became liege man to the said king Henry, through which he brought power of Englishmen into the land, and married his daughter, named Eve, at Waterford, to Sir Richard Fitz-Gilbert, earle of Stranguile in Wales, and to him granted the reversion of Leinster, with the said Eve his daughter. And after that the said earle granted to the said king Henry the citie of Dublin, with certain cantreds of lands next to Dublin, and all the haven towns of Leinster, to have the rest to him in quiet with his grace's favour.

"Another title is, that in the year of our Lord God one thousand one hundred sixtie-two, the aforesaid king Henry landed at the citie of Waterford, within the realm of Ireland, and there came to him Dermot, king of Corke, which is of the nation of the M'Carties, and of his own proper will became liege, tributarie for him and his kingdom, and upon that made his oath and gave his hostages to the king. Then the king roade to Cashell, and there came to him Donalde, king of

Should this work travel to the continent of Europe, it may produce serious consequences to

Limerick, which is of the nation of the O'Brienes, and became his liege, as the other did. Then came to him Donald, king of Ossorie, Mac-Shaglin, king of Ophaly, and all the princes of the south of Ireland, and became his liege men, as aforesaid. Then went the said king Henry to Dublin, and there came to him O'Kernill, king of Uriel, O'Rowcke, king of Meth, and Rotherick, king of all Irishmen of the land, and of Connaught, with all the princes, and men of value of the land; and became liege subjects, and tributaries, by great oathes for them, their kingdoms and lordships to the said king Henry; and that of their own good wills, as it should seem; for that *the chronicles make no mention of any warre or chivalrie done by the said king, all the time that he was in Ireland.*

"And in the year of our Lord God, a thousand, a hundred, four score and five, he gave the land of Ireland to his youngest sonne, John by name, about which time the said John came in person into Ireland, and held the same land.

"Another title is, that all the clergie of this realm assembled at Armagh, at the time of the Conquest, upon the comming over of Englishmen, our forefathers; and there it was decreed and deemed by them, that through the sin of the people of the land, by the sentence of God, the mischief of the Conquest them befell.

"Another title is, that at the first comming and being of king Richard the second in Ireland, at the citie of Dublin, and other places of the land, there came unto him, with their own good wills, O'Neyle, captain of the Irishmen of Ulster, O'Breène, of Thomond, O'Conner of Connaught, Arthur Mac Morchie, captain of Irishmen in Leinster, and all captains of Irishmen of Ireland, and became liege men to the said king Richard, and to him did homage and fealty; and for the more greater suertie bound themselves in great summes of money, by divers instruments, in case they did not truly keep and hold their allegiance in the forme aforesaid: and therefore, sayeth this clerke, that from the beginning of his time, which

the peace and independence of the United States. Many Swedes, and some of the subjects of the sublime and puissant princes of Germany have made considerable settlements in Pennsylvania. And these great potentates, following the example of the successors of Gurmond, may be tempted to lay claim to a large portion, perhaps the whole, of the state. But, alas! the evil may extend further. Certain Knickerbockerites settled New Amsterdam formerly. And therefore the puissant king of Holland may, on the same grounds, claim large sections of New York. It is, moreover, shrewdly suspected, that some of the citizens of the powerful and extensive republic of Ragusa, settled themselves among the pilgrims of New England. The Yankees may therefore look out sharp for squalls.

was about three hundred and four score years past, GOOD IS THE KING OF ENGLAND'S TITLE AND RIGHT TO THE LAND AND LORDSHIP OF IRELAND."[285]

[285] Statutes, 231.

Sometimes, notwithstanding all the various lines of circumvallation by which the vice-regal authority was fenced round, and the fraud, corruption, and venality, by which the proceedings of the legislature were managed, measures were carried there offensive to his high mightiness, the deputy for the time being. But such was the prudence and foresight of the administration of that happy kingdom, that there was an adequate remedy provided even for this disorder. It was very simple, and of easy application; being merely to tear out the leaves of the Journals, containing the obnoxious matter, in due form, and with a proper exhibit of proconsular dignity:

"On the 29th of November, 1640, the following very extraordinary memorandum appears in the Journals: "Memo. By virtue of his majesty's letters, we, the lord deputy, have, at the council-board, had *two orders of the House of Commons*, in presence of divers of the late members, *torn out of the Journals*. These orders related to presenting ways and rates to be observed in taxing the growing subsidies."[286]

[286] Mountmorres, II. 40.

## CHAPTER XIII.

*"An act of most gracious, general, and free pardon," with only fifty classes of exceptions, each averaging four or five species; that is, "a general pardon," with about two hundred exceptions.*

"Et voilà justement comme on écrit l'histoire."—*Voltaire.*

AMONG the multifarious frauds respecting Ireland, with which the world has been deluded, one of the most palpable remains to be noticed.

It is universally believed, on the uniform declarations of probably all the Anglo-Hibernian writers, that an act of general amnesty, for all offences whatsoever, was passed by the Irish Parliament, in the session which commenced anno 1613.

"The session concluded with an act of *oblivion and general pardon.*"[287]

"An act of *general pardon and oblivion* was made, in confirmation of the royal edict."[288]

"They passed an act of *general indemnity* for late crimes, with an exception of Tyrone, Tyrconnel, and O'Dogherty."[289]

"An act of *general amnesty and pardon* was made, in confirmation of the royal edict."[290]

"An act of *general oblivion and indemnity* was passed."[291]

"All minds being quieted by a *general indemnity.*"[292]

[287] Carte, I. 22. [288] Leland, II. 535. [289] Davies, xxv.
[290] Gordon, I. 327. [291] Crawford, I. 347. [292] Hume, III. 308.

A perusal of these passages, and of all the writers we have ever examined on the subject, has led the world to give credit to James and his Irish Parliament for an exuberant stock of clemency. It has appeared that their motto, and the benignant rule of their conduct, had been Shakspeare's divine commendation of heaven-born mercy:

"The quality of mercy," &c.

It is supposed that this act of "*general and free pardon*" effaced all crimes and misdemeanors of every description; was the harbinger of an universal jubilee throughout the kingdom; and, from the hour of its promulgation, produced a general clearance of the prisons of all their tenants, by whatsoever tenure they had been held there. But, alas! in Ireland, words bore an import different from what they had in any other country: and "an act of *general pardon*," in that ill-fated nation, was, in truth and in fact, an act of *universal proscription:* for in that Parliament and king, towards Ireland,

"There was no more mercy, than milk in a male tiger."[293]

This assertion will appear ambiguous: but the ambiguity shall be soon removed. The act in question bears, it is true, in the Statute-Book, the fraudulent title of "an act for the king's majestie's *most gracious, general, and free par-*

[293] Shakspeare.

*don.*"* This is as clear and explicit as language could render it; and, as the act itself is in black-

**Extracts from "An Act for the king's majestie's most gracious,* GENERAL, AND FREE PARDON!!!"

The king's majestie, most graciously considering the good will and faithful hearts of his most loving subjects, which as at all times, so at this present especially, they having with most dutiful affection showed themselves towards his highness; and understanding that the same his loving subjects have many and sundry wayes, by the laws and statutes of this realm, fallen into the danger of diverse great penalties and forfeytures, is, of his princely and merciful disposition, most graciously inclined, by his liberal and free pardon, to discharge some part of those great paynes, forfeytures and penalties wherewith his said subjects stand now burdened and charged; trusting they will be thereby the rather moved and induced, from henceforth, more carefully to observe his highness's laws and statutes, and to continue in their loyal and due obedience to his majestie; and therefore his majestie is well pleased and contented, that it be enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, in manner and form following, (that is to say) That all and every the said subjects, as well spiritual as temporal of this his highness's realm of Ireland, the heyres, successors, executors, and administrators of them, and every of them, and all and singular bodies corporate, cities, shires, boroughs, hundreds, baronies, townes, villages, hamlets, and tythings, and every of them, and the successor and successors of every of them, shall be, by the authority of this present Parliament, acquitted, pardoned, and released, and discharged against the king's majestie, his heyres and successors, and every of them, *of all manner of treasons, felonies, offences, contempts, trespasses, entries, wrongs, deceipts, misdemeanours, forfeytures, penalties, and summs of mony, paynes of death, paynes corporal and pecuniarie, and generally of all other things, causes, quarrels, suites, judgments and executions, in this present Act hereafter not excepted nor foreprized.*

letter, obsolete orthography, and very long, it is probable that those writers never examined be-

1. "Except and alwayes foreprized out of this general and free pardon, *all and all manner of high treasons, and other offences committed or done by any person or persons against the king's majestie*, and all conspiracies and confederacies, trayterously had, committed, or done, by any person or persons, against the king's majestie's royal person; and all manner of levying warre and all rebellions and insurrections whatsoever had, made, or committed, or done at any time sithence the beginning of his majesty's raigne.

2. "And also excepted *all and every manner of treasons committed or done*, by any person or persons in the parts beyond the seas, or in any other place out of the king's dominions, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne; and also all suites, punishments, executions, paynes of death, forfeitures, and penalties, for, or by reason or occasion of any of the treasons and offences before rehearsed.

3. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all offences of forging and false counterfeyting* the king's majestie his great or privy seale, sign manual, or privy signet, or any of the monies current within this realm; and also all offences of unlawfull diminishing of any the said monies, by any wayes or means whatsoever, contrary to the laws and statutes of this realm at any time sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne; and also all misprisions and concealments of any the high treasons aforesaid, and also all abetting, aiding, comforting or procuring of the same offences, or any of the said treasons committed or done sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

4. "And also excepted out of this pardon, *all manner of voluntary murders, petit treasons, and wilfull poisonings*, done or committed by any person or persons sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne, and all and every the accessaries to the said offences, or any of them, before the said offences committed.

5. "And also excepted and foreprised out of this general pardon *all and every offence of piracy, and robbery done upon the seas*, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

yond the title, or, at all events, beyond the preamble, which carries the same delusive promise

6. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all burglaries* committed or done in any dwelling house or houses, and all accessaries to any the said burglaries, before the said burglaries committed, within one year before the beginning of this present session of Parliament.

7. "And also excepted *all robberies* done upon, or to any man's or woman's person in the high-way, or elsewhere, and all and singular accessaries of, or to any such robberies before the said robbery, committed within one year before the first day of this present session of Parliament.

8. "And also excepted *the felonious stealing of any horse, gelding, garron, or mare*, and all accessaries thereunto, before the same felony committed, and all judgments and executions of and for the same, within one year next before the beginning of this present session of Parliament.

9. "And also, *all wilfull burnings of any dwelling house or houses*, or any barn or barns, wherein any corn was, committed or done at any time sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

10. "And also excepted *all rapes and carnal ravishments of women*, and also ravishments and wilfull taking away or marrying any maide, widdowe, or damosel, against her will, or without the assent or agreement of her parents, or such as then had her in custodie, committed or done within one year before the beginning of this present session of Parliament. And also all offences of ayding, comforting, procuring or abetting of any such ravishment, wilfull taking away or marrying, had, committed or done.

11. "And also excepted out of this pardon all persons *now attainted or outlawed*, of or for any treason, petit treason, murder, wilfull poysoning, burglary, or robbery, and all executions of and for the same.

12. "And also excepted all offences of *invocations, conjurations, witchcraft, sorceries, inchantments and charms*, and all offences of procuring, abetting, or comforting of the same, and all persons now attainted and convicted of any of the said of-

of clemency: but, with Shakspeare, we may well exclaim,

"Oh! what a goodly outside falsehood hath!"

fences, at any time sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

13. "And also excepted all and every manner or taking from the king's majestie, of any the goods or chattels, or the issues, rents, revenues or profits of any mannors, lands, tenements, and hereditaments, which were of any traytor, murderer, felon, clerke or clerkes attainted, or fugitives, or of any of them.

14. "And also excepted *all goods and chattels*, in any wise forfeited to the king's majestie by treason, petit treason, murder, or felony, heretofore committed or done.

15. "And also excepted all offences of or in making, writing, printing, or publishing, or in consenting to the making, writing, printing, or publishing, of *any false, seditious, or slaunderous book* or books, libell or libells, in any wise against the king's majestie, or the present government of this realme, in cases either ecclesiasticall or temporall, or against any person or persons whatsoever.

16. "And also excepted out of this pardon all intrusions, had, or made, or done by any person or persons, in or upon any of the mannors, lands, tenements, or other hereditaments of our said sovereign lord the king; and all wastes done, committed or suffered upon any such lands, tenements, or hereditaments, and the wrongfull taking of any the rents, issues, and profits of the same mannors, lands, tenements, or hereditaments, of our said sovereign lord the king, at any time sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne. And also all suites, accounts and impetitions, of and for the same.

17. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all alienations of any lands*, tenements or hereditaments, without license, and all fines, issues and profits, that may or ought to grow or come to the king's majestie, by reason of any such alienations, without license, at any time sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

And never was there more "falsehood" under a "goodly outside," than in this instance. For, in

18. "And also excepted out of this pardon, *all wastes committed or done*, in any of the king's wards' lands, or in the wards' lands of any of the king's counties; and also all and every fine or fines, for the single and double value of the marriage or marriages of all and every ward or wards, at any time heretofore grown to the king's majestie, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

19. "And also excepted *concealed wards, and the lands of such wards concealed*, and all liveries and primer seisins and ousterlemains, that ought to be had, done or sued for the same, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

20. "And also excepted out of this general pardon *all ravishments* and wrongfull taking or withholding any the king's ward or wards, lands or rents, and profits of the same, at any time coming or growing to the king's hands, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne; and every thing that by reason of any such ward or wards' lands, and for default of suing or prosecuting, of any livery for any such wards' lands ought to come or to be to the king's majestie, and which as yet is not discharged.

21. "And also excepted *all fines* that should or ought to grow to the king's majestie, of any his widdows that have married without license, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne.

22. "And also excepted and foreprised out of this pardon, *all such persons as*, the last day of this present session of Parliament, *be in prison*, within the castle of Dublin, or in the prison of Marshalsie, or otherwise restrained of liberty by express commandment of the lord deputy, or by the commandment or directions of any his majestie's privy council.

23. "And also excepted out of this pardon all and every such person and persons which at any time sithence the beginning of the king's majestie's raigne, *have fled out of this realm of Ireland*, or any other the king's dominions, for any offence of high treason, petit treason, or misprision of treason.

the body of this "act of general and free pardon," there are no less than FIFTY CLASSES OF EXCEP-

24. "And also excepted all such persons as be gone or fled out of this realm, for any cause contrarie to the laws and statutes of this realm, without the king's majestie's license.

25. "And also excepted all such persons as have obtained and had license to depart this realm, for certain time, and now do abide out of this realm, without any lawful excuse, after the time of their licenses expired.

26. "And also excepted out of this pardon all and every concealments or wrongfull detainments of any custom or subsidie due to the king's majestie, sithence the beginning of his majestie's raigne, and all corruptions and misdemeanours of any officer or minister of or concerning any custom or subsidie, and all accompts, impetitions and suites to be had, made or done for the same.

27. "And also excepted all and singular accompts of all and every collector and collectors of any subsidie, custom, imposition, composition or other thing; and all accompts of every other person whatsoever that ought to be accomptant to the king's highness, and the heirs, executors, and administrators of every such person that ought to accompt for all things touching only the same accompts; and all and singular arrearages of accompts, and all untrue accompts, and all petitions, charges, and seisures, suites, demaunds, and executions which may or can be had, of or for any accompts or any arrearages of the same.

28. "And also excepted *all titles and actions of quare impedit*, and all homages, reliefe and reliefes, heriots, rents, services, rent charges, rent secks, and the arrearages of the same, not done or paid to the king's highness.

29. "And also excepted *all conditions and covenants*, and all penalties, titles and forfeytures of condition or conditions, covenant or covenants, accrued or grown to the king's majestie, by reason of the breach and not performing of any covenants or conditions.

TIONS, embracing almost every conceivable crime of which the Statute-Book takes cognizance; and

30. "And also excepted *all summs of money* granted by the king's majestie, or any his noble progenitors; and all concealments, fraudes and offences by which his majesty hath been deceived or not truly answered of or for the same.

31. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all debtes* which were or be due to our soveraign lord the king, or to the most noble queen Elizabeth, of famous memorie, or to any person or persons for or to any of their uses, by any condemnation, recognizance, obligation or otherwise, other than such debts as are due upon any obligation or recognizance forfeyted before the first day of this present session of Parliament; for not appearance in any court or other place whatsoever; or for not keeping of the peace, or not being of good behaviour, which debts growen and accrued upon these cases, by this free pardon be and shall be freely pardoned and discharged.

32. "And also excepted and foreprized out of this pardon *all and singular penalties, forfeytures and summs of money*, being due, and accrued to our soveraign lord the king, by reason of any act, statute, or statutes: which forfeytures, penalties and summs of money be converted into the nature of debts, by any judgment, order or decree, or by the agreement of the offendour or offenders, sithence the beginning of the raigne of the late queen Elizabeth.

33. "And also excepted *all forfeytures of leases and estates or interests* of any lands, tenements or hereditaments, holden of our soveraign lord the king's majestie by knight service, or in socage, in capite, or otherwise by knight service made in one or several assurances or leases for any term or terms of years, whereupon the old and accustomed rent or more is not reserved.

34. "And also excepted all first fruits at this present being due to be paid to his majestie, by force of any act or statute or otherwise.

35. "And also excepted all penalties and forfeytures whereof there is any verdict in any suit given or past for the king's majestie.

which, for the purpose of adding one more to the various proofs we have already adduced, of the

36. "And also excepted *all forfeytures* and other penalties and profits now due, accrued and growen, or which shall or may be due, accrued or growing to the king's majestie, by reason of any offence, misdeameanour, contempt, or act or deed, suffered, had, committed, or done, contrary to any act, statute or statutes, or contrary to the common laws of this realm, and whereof or for the which any action, bill, plaint or information, at any time within eight years next before the last day of this present session of Parliament, hath been or shall be exhibited, commenced or sued in the courts of Castle Chamber or in any the king's majestie's courts at Dublin, and now is, or the said last day of this session of Parliament, shall be there depending, and remaining to be prosecuted, or whereof the king's majestie, by his bill assigned, hath heretofore made any gift or assignment to any person or persons.

37. "And also excepted out of this general and free pardon *all offences*, *contempts*, *disorders*, *covins*, *frauds*, *deceipts and misdemeanours whatsoever*, heretofore committed or done by any person or persons, and whereof or for the which any suit, by bill, plaint or information, at any time within four years next before the last day of this present session of Parliament, is or shall be commenced or exhibited in the court of Castle Chamber, and shall be there the same last day of this session of Parliament depending, or whereupon any sentence or decree is given or entered.

38. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all offences of perjuries* and subornations of witnesses, and offences of forging and counterfeiting of any false deeds, escriptes or writings; and all procuring and counselling of any such counterfeiting or forging to be had or made.

39. "And also excepted out of this pardon all offences of *incest*, *adultery*, *fornication and simony*, and all such usury for which any interest hath been received or taken since the first day of this present session of Parliament; and *all misdemeanours and disturbances* committed or made in any church or chappel, in the time of common prayer, preaching or divine

fidelity of Irish historians, are enumerated in the annexed note.

service there used, to the disturbance thereof; and all outlawries and prosecutions upon the same.

40. "And also excepted all offences whereby any person may be charged with the penalty and danger of premunire, and of the which offence or offences any person standeth already indicted, or otherwise lawfully condemned or convicted.

41. "And also excepted all dilapidations for which any suit is, or before the end of this session of Parliament shall be, depending.

42. "And also excepted all offences in taking away, *imbeyselling or purloyning* any the king's majestie's goods, money, chattels, jewels, armour, munition, ordinance, or other habiliments of warre.

43. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all manner of extortions* whatsoever.

44. "And also excepted all covins, frauds, deceipts and other disorders and misdemeanours whatsoever, heretofore committed or done by any steward of his majestie's mannours or courts, under sheriffe, or by any officer or minister in any of his highness' courts, in or by reason or colour of any of their offices or places, or any their deputys or clerkes; and all offences of ayding, comforting, assisting or procuring of any under sheriffe or any such officer, minister, or clerke, in continuing, doing or executing any such extortion, exaction, covin, fraud, deceipt, disorder or misdemeanour.

45. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all issues, fines and amercements* being totted, levied or received by any sheriffe, under sheriffe, bayliffe, minister or other officer, to or for the king's majestie's use or behoofe, before the last day of this present session of Parliament; and all issues, fines and amerciaments affered, taxed, estreated or entered severally or particularly, touching or concerning any one person or more persons joyntly or severally, above the sum of six pounds.

46. "And also excepted all issues, fines and amerciaments affered, taxed, set or entered severally or particularly in any court of record at Dublin, at any time sithence the feast of

The extracts from this act are longer, perhaps, than are consistent with the nature of this work:

Saint Bartholomew last past; and yet nevertheless all other fines, as well *finis pro licentio concordandi*, as other set, taxed, estreated or entered afore the said feast of Saint Bartholomew; and also all issues and amerciaments as well real as others, within any liberties or without, being set, taxed, estreated or entered afore the said feast of Saint Bartholomew, and which severally or particularly extend to or under the summ of six pounds, and not above, whether they be estreated or not estreated, or whether they be turned into debt or not turned into debt, and not being totted, levied or recovered by any sheriffe, under sheriffe, minister or other officer, to or for the king's majestie's use or behoof, before the last day of this present session of Parliament, shall be freely, clearly and plainly pardoned and discharged against the king's majestie, his heyres and successours for ever, by force of this present act of free pardon; and yet nevertheless, all estreats of such fines, issues and amerciaments as be now pardoned by this act, and be already estreated forth of the court of exchequer, and be remaining in the hand of the sheriffe, under sheriffe and bayliffe for collecting of the same fines, issues and amerciaments, shall, upon the return of the same estreats, be orderly charged and delivered by scrowls into the office of the pipe in the court of exchequer, as heretofore hath been accustomed, to the intent that thereupon order may be taken that his majesty may be truly answered in all fines, issues and amerciaments not by this act pardoned, and which any sheriffe, under sheriffe, bayliffe or other officer or minister hath received or ought to answer for by force or colour of any such estreat, processe or precept to him or them made for the levying thereof: and yet notwithstanding all and every sheriffe and sheriffes and other accomptants, upon his or their petition or petitions, to be made for the allowance of any such fines, issues and amerciaments as, by this act pardoned, shall have all and every such his and their petition allowed in his or their accompt and accompts, without paying any fee or reward to any officer, clerk or other

but we trust they will be excused; as no abridgment could do justice to the subject, or to the grand object we have in view, which is to open the eyes of every reader, who is not wilfully blind, to the undeviating fraud, falsehood, and

minister, for the making, entering or allowing of any such petition, any usage or custome to the contrary notwithstanding.

47. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all goods, chattels, debts, actions and suites already forfeited*, or whereof any right or title is accrued and growen to the king's majestie by reason of any outlawry, and whereof the king's majestie, by his highness's letters patent, hath, before the last day of this present session of Parliament, made any grant, covenant or proviso to any person or persons.

48. "And also excepted out of this pardon *all such persons as be and remain still attainted or condemned*, and not already pardoned, of or for any rebellion or levying of warre, or of or for any conspiracy of any rebellion or levying of warre, within this realm, or in any other the king's dominions.

49. "And also excepted all false forging and counterfeiting of any untrue certificates.

50. "And also excepted all false forging and counterfeiting of any commission or commissions to inquire of any lands, tenements or hereditaments: or return of any commission or commissions obtained or gotten of any court or courts to inquire of any lands, tenements or other things whatsoever; and all and all manner of falsifying of any particular, or of any bill or bills signed by his majestie after the ingrossing thereof, and before the passing of the same unto the great seal.

51. "Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that this act of general pardon shall not in any wise extend to any person outlawed upon any writ of *capias ad satisfaciendum*, until such time as the person so outlawed shall satisfie, or otherwise agree with the party at whose suit the same person was so outlawed or condemned."[294]

[294] Statutes, 327.

imposture, that run through the whole body of the Anglo-Hibernian histories of Ireland, as penned by those writers who have pandered to the passions, the prejudices, and the grinding tyranny of "the Protestant ascendency," and contaminated and corrupted the history of Ireland to an extent unequalled in that of any other portion of the terraqueous globe. This object we feel proudly confident we have accomplished, with such of our readers as have brought to the perusal of this work, a mind disposed to hail the appearance of holy Truth, in whatsoever form she may appear.

We hope the reader will bear in remembrance the deceptious statement of this act, as he peruses some of the subsequent chapters, in which, from the nature of the subjects, the detection of imposture is rendered difficult, and, in fact, would be impossible, if the stupidity of the projectors were not on a par with their wickedness. Had their ingenuity amounted to a twentieth part of their fraud, they might have contrived tales so plausible as to bid defiance to detection: but fortunately their fabrications are compacted together with so much grossness and incoherence, that it requires but moderate abilities to expose them, in all their naked deformity, to the contempt and loathing of every liberal mind. Had those tales, however, been devised with talents equal to the wickedness of the contrivers, and furnished no internal evidence to

condemn them, even in that case they would merit rejection; as we have established, in the historians who narrate them, a total disregard of truth, and the strongest and most palpable facts, in every instance which admitted of producing evidence. This act of "gracious, general, and free pardon," would, if it stood alone, be sufficient to decide the question. It is recorded in the Statute-Book; open to the inspection of all the writers who have treated on it; and detection, like the well-known "sword of Damocles," hung over the head of imposture or sophistication. Yet, notwithstanding all these strong circumstances, we see that its real character is as diametrically opposite to the views given of it, as the pitchy darkness of the lowest regions of Erebus to the starry canopy of heaven. And will not every man of mind ask, what dependence, in points involved in doubt, obscurity, or mystery, such as plots and conspiracies, can be placed on writers who poison the pure streams of history, in such plain cases as this, and so many others which we have exhibited to the reader?

## CHAPTER XIV.

*The age of forgery, plots, and perjury.*

IN every age of the world, some peculiar folly or wickedness has prevailed, which distinguished it from those which preceded, as well as from those which followed, with nearly as much accuracy as the varied features of the face distinguish one man from another.

Were we called upon to fix the peculiar feature of the seventeenth century, in the wide range of the British dominions, we should, without hesitation, pronounce it to have been the age of forgery, perjury, and fabricated plots, contrived for the purpose of overwhelming the innocent in ruin, and enriching malefactors with their spoils.

It is hardly credible, at the present day, when those dire passions that actuated so large a portion of the community in England and Ireland, during that period, have wholly subsided, and are now almost inconceivable, what a number of these contrivances were employed; how regularly they succeeded each other; what mischievous consequences they produced; and yet how excessively stupid the most of them were. Many of them, which were devoured with greedy ears by

the great and little vulgar, are so ridiculous, so absurd, and so utterly improbable, that, at the present day, they would not impose on a gang of swine-herds.

Previous to entering into the examination and detection of the miserable pretended conspiracy of 1641, which led to scenes of horror, desolation, and massacre of the Irish, that chill the blood in the veins, we shall present the reader with a few facts, to satisfy him that the fabrication of pretended plots was a regular trade, pursued upon a most extensive scale; was one of the levers by which the movements of the political machine were regulated; and that consistency, coherence, probability, or even possibility, were not necessary to ensure its success.

We have already established the efficacy of this infamous system, in producing confiscation in Ireland; and how thousands were involved in ruin, and their posterity for ages consigned to poverty, by the dropping of a wretched catchpenny letter. We have shown, that after Tyrone, a nobleman of high grade and princely possessions among the Irish, had rendered important services to the state, and received a wound, fighting in its defence against his own countrymen, he was almost immediately charged with a conspiracy, on grounds the most frivolous and contemptible, merely from the lust of spoliating his immense estate; and that the same vile course was pursued with Shane O'Neal, whose estate

was finally confiscated, after he was basely assassinated, at the instigation of the lord deputy, who publicly paid the assassin the price of his infamy, and thus stamped a brand of eternal infamy on his name, which all the cataracts of the Niagara could never efface.*

The low herd of hardened wretches, who perjured themselves by swearing to those plots, as well as those of the higher orders, equally hardened, who suborned them for this execrable purpose,† felt no "compunctious visitings" of remorse, that torrents of blood were occasionally shed, through the means of their perjuries.

"Their conscience, wide as hell,"[295]

suffered no nausea at the immolation of hosts of innocent victims on the bloody altars of their ambition, their avarice, and their vengeance.

Many of the instruments used on those occasions, were the basest and most wicked of man-

* "On a signal given, the soldiers rushed in; butchered the wretched guests; and buried their weapons in O'Neal. The intelligence of his death was conveyed to the lord deputy by Piers, who sent his head to Dublin, and RECEIVED ONE THOUSAND MARKS AS HIS REWARD."[296]

† "Leaders so little scrupulous, as to endeavour, by encouraging perjury, subornation, lies, imposture, and even by *shedding innocent blood*, to gratify their own furious ambition."[297]

[295] Shakspeare. [296] Leland, II. 286, 287.
[297] Hume, IV. 331.

kind,*—wretches elaborated, in prisons, in stews, and other hot-beds and nurseries of villany, to the last degree of turpitude of which man is capable. Their stories were so contradictory, that the falsehood and perjury were manifest to the most cursory observer: but such was the general depravity and delusion of the times, and such the devouring thirst for the blood of the victims, that no profligacy in the witnesses, no contradiction, no improbability, no impossibility in the evidence, no degree of immaculate innocence in the objects of their rage and malice, could save them from destruction. Accusation and condemnation were, in almost every instance, synonimous terms.

* "Oates, the informer of this dreadful plot, was himself THE MOST INFAMOUS OF MANKIND. He was the son of an Anabaptist preacher, chaplain to colonel Pride; but having taken orders in the church, he had been settled in a small living by the duke of Norfolk. He had been indicted for perjury, and by some means had escaped. He was afterwards a chaplain on board the fleet, whence he had been dismissed, on complaint of some unnatural practices, not fit to be named."[298]

"Such bountiful encouragement brought forth new witnesses. William Bedlow, *a man, if possible, more infamous than Oates*, appeared next upon the stage. He was of very low birth; had been noticed for *several cheats, and even thefts;* had travelled over many parts of Europe, *under borrowed names;* and frequently passed himself for a man of quality, and had endeavoured, by a variety of lies and contrivances, *to prey upon the ignorant and unwary.*"[299]

[298] Hume, IV. 315. [299] Idem, 322.

In those days, conspirators were accustomed, if we believe the depositions of some of the plot-contrivers, to stand in the open streets and highways, and converse about their conspiracies and treasons, as publicly and unreservedly as at present we convey to each other the intelligence of the price of stocks, the state of the weather, or any of those important nothings which form so large a portion of what is called conversation. This free and easy system was quite convenient to the informers, as it saved them much trouble in searching for evidence.

On one occasion, the English House of Lords was alarmed by the important information given by an Italian, that he heard an Irishman, *in the street*, inform a certain Francisco, IN ITALIAN, that a plot was laid to kill some members of that House, particularly the earls of Northumberland, Essex, Holland, &c.* The House of Lords attach-

* "Jan. 11, 1641–2. This day, one Francis Moor, an Italian, gave in an information to the House of Lords, That yesterday he stood talking with an Irishman, who lives with the lord viscount Loftus, *in the street*, and overheard ONE BRIAN KELLY, AN IRISHMAN, *servant* to the earl of Arundel, SPEAK IN ITALIAN [!] to one Signior Francisco, an Italian, and say, That there was a plot laid to kill some lords of the Parliament; and in particular named the earl of Northumberland, the earl of Essex, the earl of Holland, the earl of Pembroke, and the earl of Leicester.

"Hereupon, it is ordered, That the said Brian Kelly and Signior Francisco shall be forthwith apprehended, and attached by the gentleman usher attending this house, and brought as delinquents to the bar, and charged with the words; Kelly

ed great importance to the affair, and summoned the parties to the bar: but it ended in smoke, after the purposes for which it had been fabricated were answered.

The Irishman being so polite as to speak to his brother conspirator in Italian, it is highly probable that the latter, not to be outdone in politeness, replied in Gælic or Irish. But, as the historian is silent on the subject, I would not be understood as committing myself, by any thing more than suggesting it as plausible,—leaving it to the better judgment of the reader to decide.

But, of all the informers of those days, a certain Thomas Beal, a taylor, merited the palm. None of the confraternity could stand a comparison with him. He gave minute details of a plot, in which one hundred and eight persons had engaged to murder as many members of Parliament. The wages they were to receive for this pleasant and amusing business, were very moderate, particularly for the commons, who were not valued at more than twenty per cent. of the lords. The latter were to be paid for at the rate of ten pounds per man: but the poor members of the Lower House were valued at only forty shillings. The feats were to be performed as the members were coming down stairs from the

denied that he ever spake any such words. Thereupon Moor was called in to confront him, and upon oath averred what he had formerly informed."[300]

[300] Nalson, II. 843.

Parliament House, or taking their coaches, or going into their lodgings.*

* "House of Lords, Nov. 15, 1641. Thomas Beal, a taylor, dwelling in White-Cross street, was called in, and made a relation of the whole plot, with all the circumstances, which were as follows:

"That this day, at twelve of the clock, he went into the fields, near the Pot-house: and walking over a private bank, he heard some talking, but did not see them at first; but finding them by the voice, he coming within hearing of them, understood they talked of state affairs: and going nearer them, he heard one of them say, that it was a wicked thing, that the last plot did not take; but if this goes on, as is in hand and intended, they shall all be made. Heard them say, that there were *an hundred and eight men appointed, to kill an hundred and eight members of the Parliament, every one his man;* some were lords, and others were to be members of the House of Commons, all Puritans; and the sacrament was to be administered to the hundred and eight men, for performing of this; and those that killed the lords were to have *ten pounds*, and those that killed the members of the House of Commons, *forty shillings*. That Gorges, being the thirty-seventh man, had taken the sacrament on Saturday, to kill one of the House of Commons, and had received forty shillings. That one Phillips coming to London on Sunday night late, was charged to be at my lord's chamber, where was only my lord, father Jones, and father Andrews: he also had his charge, and five more with him, he being the hundred and eighth man, and the last, as he thought.

"That Phillips had been in Warwickshire and Buckinghamshire, with letters; and that he delivered letters to Mr. Sheldon, who gave him his dinner, and a piece for his pains, charging him to make haste to London again, and giving him letters to deliver to my lord.

"That Dick Jones was appointed to kill that rascally Puritan Pym; and that four tradesmen were to kill the Puritan citizens which were Parliament men.

This plot, which highly alarmed both lords and commons, is one of those which, as we have

"That on the same day, being the 18th of this month, when the city shall be in a tumult, there shall be risings in six several parts of this land, by the Papists; viz. in Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Buckinghamshire, Lancashire, and two other places which he remembers not.

"That those that were to kill the lords were *brave gallants in their scarlet coats*, and had received every man ten pounds a-piece; and when that was gone, they might come and fetch more.

"That this was to be done either *coming down stairs*, or *taking their coaches*, or *entering into their lodgings*, or any other way, as they should see opportunity.

"That although all were not killed, yet the tumult would be so great, that it would prevent sending to Ireland, and that was father Andrews his wit, to prevent sending thither; because if they prevailed there, they should not have cause to fear here."[301]

"Nov. 16, 1641. The lords and commons assembled in Parliament, having received informations of dangerous designs and practices, by priests and Jesuits, and ill-affected persons, to disturb the peace of this state, and the proceedings of Parliament, and to attempt upon the persons of many of the members of both Houses; and well know that there is no way to prevent the mischief which the malice of such men may suddenly bring upon the realm, to the utter subversion of our religion, laws, and liberties, but by putting the kingdom into a posture of defence, and so to be ready, upon all occasions, to oppose force to force."[302]

"The commons acquainted their lordships, that they have discovered some things further concerning the plot which was related by Beal; for, upon examination, they are informed, that there are two such priests as father Jones and father Andrews; Jones, they understand, is here in town, at the earl

[301] Nalson, II. 646. [302] Idem, 649.

stated, would now hardly impose upon a gang of swine-herds. The idea of a large body of "*brave gallants*," not, as Sir John Falstaff says, "*in Kendal green*," but "*in scarlet coats*," for the purpose of rendering themselves conspicuous, engaged to poignard an equal number of members of Parliament coming out of the house, or going into their carriages, the major part for only forty shillings a head, would form an admirable episode in Baron Munchausen. But, absurd and ridiculous as it was, the "greedy maw" of public delusion and prejudice cheerfully swallowed it, as suitable refection for its devouring appetite.

A plot for which Sir Henry Beddingfield was apprehended, is more absurd and nonsensical than Beal's, though not so much detailed. It is difficult to conjecture what it means, from the deposition* of the informer who communicated

of Worcester's house; and Andrews is described to be near fifty years of age, and uses to come much to Sir Basil Brook's house.

"The House of Commons further thinks fit, that a declaration be made, that whosoever of the hundred and eight men, designed to do this mischief, shall come in and discover the same, both Houses will be humble suitors to the king that they may be pardoned, and they shall be well rewarded."[303]

* "William Shales, sergeant of the foot company under the command of Sir Arthur Loftus, knight, saith, That about the latter end of April last, he being then in Norfolk, in Oxborough Hall, in the house of Sir Henry Beddingfield, the said Sir Henry, hearing that this examinant was lately come out of Ireland, sent for him into his garden, whither when he came,

[303] Nalson, II. 649.

the important information. We state it merely to show the ridiculous grounds on which these fabrications rested.

A plot was fabricated, of which the pretended object was to kill Charles II. Lord Castlemain

he found the said Sir Henry walking with one Poole, (whom this examinant supposeth was a priest) and saith, that as soon as he came into the said garden, the said Sir Henry asked him whether he knew how the state of Ireland then stood? To which the examinant said, that he thought that all things were quiet and at peace there. Why (quoth Sir Henry) doth the army then do nothing? To which the examinant replied, That they carried themselves quietly, and that any man might walk in Ireland with a thousand pounds, and a wand only in his hand. He saith also, that the said Sir Henry told him, That he was about to take a house in Kilkenny, of one of the Butlers, for that there was no safety in England for any of his religion; and asked of the examinant, whether there were any good hawking thereabouts? To which the examinant said that there was. Then the said Sir Henry said, That now his mind was altered, and that he meant to stay in England; and added, That he did believe, that before Christmas day next, there should be seen such combustions in England and Ireland, as the like were never seen before; and thereupon cursed the Scots as the authors of these troubles.

William Shales.

Jurat. Coram nobis.
James Ware,
Robert Meredith.

"Whereupon it was ordered, That Sir Henry Beddingfield should be sent for in safe custody by the gentleman usher of the House; and none permitted to speak with him, but in the presence of the messenger; and that his study should be sealed up by the two next justices of the peace, till the further pleasure of the House be known."[304]

[304] Nalson, II. 661.

was among the parties accused.[305] The details were of the most absurd and incredible character. On the trial, the principal evidence was one Dangerfield, a most profligate and worthless villain.* There were sixteen records of convictions produced in court, to prove that he was not a competent witness.[306] He had been convicted of felony, had broken prison, been outlawed, branded in the hand,† been four times convicted of forging the coin, once as a common cheat, been each time put in the pillory, and been guilty of almost every species of crime: but such was the abandoned character of the court, so completely

* "The nation had gotten so much into the vein of credulity, and *every necessitous villain was so much incited by the success of Oates and Bedlow*, that even during the prorogation the people were not allowed to remain in tranquillity. There was one Dangerfield, *a fellow who had been burned in the hand for crimes, transported, whipped, pilloried four times, fined for cheats, outlawed for felony, convicted of coining, exposed to all the public infamy which the laws could inflict on the basest and most shameful enormities.* The credulity of the people, and the humour of the times, enabled even this man to become a person of consequence."[307]

† On this trial, a ludicrous opinion was given by the judges of the Common Pleas, who were consulted by lord Raymond, whether a pardon, which had been granted to Dangerfield, rendered his evidence admissible. "They say," states lord Raymond, "that if he had been convicted of felony, *and not burnt in the hand, the pardon would not have set him upright:* but being convicted and *burnt in the hand*, they suppose *he is a witness*."[308]

305 State Trials, VII. 1067
306 Idem, 1084, 1102–3.
307 Hume, IV. 349.
308 State Trials, VII. 1090.

poisoned were the streams of justice, and so violent was the rage against the accused, that these solid objections were all over-ruled, and his evidence received as if he had been the most immaculate character in the nation.

In a virulent and fabulous book, published under the title of "Memoirs of Ireland, from the Restoration to the present time," which contains almost as many lies as sentences, there is a curious account of one of those wonderful plots. It is quite an original; and deserves to be brought to light once more, out of compliment to the talents of the fabricator who could devise, and to the sagacity of the stupid public which could digest, such a tale.

It states, that a massacre of the Protestants in Ireland was intended, anno 1670: preparatory to which, "the priests ordered their congregations at mass," to fix "*over their doors a cross made of straw.*" This cross was to be a mark to the assassins not to molest the inhabitants, "when the bloody massacre was to be perpetrated." All "the men, women, and children" in the houses devoid of the straw cross,

"God save the mark!"

were "to be butchered, and the houses burned." This is very amusing, truly; and a mere matter of course. But the enigmatical part of the plot remains. The crosses "were so little," that "the Protestants took no notice of them" *by daylight*, although the cut-throats, to whom they

were to afford directions, were to be governed by them *at night*, as that time alone was fit for such deeds of blood. And, although the directions had been given from the altar, throughout the kingdom, "*the matter was carried with so much secrecy*," that "the priests themselves" were ignorant of what was meant, and "believed that it was designed to bless the people's houses." And this miserable fabrication was credited; excited a vast deal of alarm among "the Protestant ascendency;" and afforded a pretext for the further oppression and persecution of the Roman Catholics:

"The priests, by directions from their superiors, *ordered their several congregations*, *at mass*, that, at such a time, every Roman Catholic should fix over their doors A CROSS MADE OF STRAW. The people were curious to understand the reason of this order; but *the matter was carried with so much secrecy*, that the priests themselves, it is believed, knew no more than that it was designed to bless the people's houses. This was generally performed: and, at the same time, vast multitudes of priests came from beyond sea; who, as appears by the sequel, were better acquainted with the bottom of *this black and damnable intrigue*, than generally the poor ignorant priests of Ireland were, to whom *the hellish conclave at Rome* did not think fit to communicate a matter of this *private and great importance*. The plot was formed after the ensuing manner. *This signal of the cross was to distinguish the Papists from the Protestants*, when THE BLOODY MASSACRE WAS TO BE PERPETRATED. Where no cross was found on the door, *all within the house*, *men*, *women*, *and children*, *were to be butchered*, *on a certain day*, *and their houses burnt*. Intimation of this design being given to the magistracy, search was made; and crosses accordingly found at

most of the Papists' doors in the province of Munster. They were so little, that the Protestants took no notice of them. The priest, who discovered the plot first, ran away, and was no more heard of."[309]

The pretences of plots and conspiracies were constantly employed, throughout the century.* The public mind was kept in unceasing fermentation;† which was excited to the highest degree, when any object of Irish oppression or degradation was to be accomplished, and the excitement was always proportioned to the magnitude of that

* "*It was thought politic to have recourse to one* [a sham plot] *in the present exigence.* For this purpose a committee was appointed to inquire into informations against the Irish, and the danger of the kingdom from them. Informations of one sort or other will never be wanting, when it is the interest of men in power to encourage them: and *they are sure to be received with favour*, *and swallowed without examination*, however trifling, ridiculous, and improbable."[310]

† "*They revived the rumours of new plots and conspiracies;* received informations of many dark designs and suspicious proceedings of the Irish; alarmed the government with the danger of public commotions; and, though all their industry could produce no material discoveries, yet it served their purpose of loading an obnoxious party with additional odium, at a time when they were to contend with them for estates and settlements."[311]

"Reports [were] spread by these agents and their creatures, as if the Irish Roman Catholics were *ready to raise a new rebellion* in that country. *This was a thing impossible to be conceived* by any body that knew the real state and miserable condition of those people at this time in Ireland."[312]

[309] Memoirs of Ireland, 15.
[310] Carte, II. 223.
[311] Leland, IV. 125.
[312] Carte, II. 205.

object.* In no instance did this system fail of complete success.

* "The house, to throw an odium upon that nation, and prejudice them in the opinion of the world, as well as of his majesty, before whom their all lay at stake, *would needs infer a formed design of an insurrection.* But the whole kingdom knew they were in no condition to rebel, nor was it likely they should attempt it at a time, when they were suing for grace and favour from his majesty. Sir M. Eustace, the lord chancellor, a man of great virtue and integrity, who wished well to a true loyal English interest, and not to a pretended one of disaffected and unconformable upstarts, was persuaded of the injustice, as well as the design of this charge against the Irish; and, to discover what ground there was for it, directed the judges in their circuits to cause the matter to be inquired into by the grand juries of the several counties through which they passed. The finding of those juries was alike in all places; there being *a great calm every where, no preparation for a rising, nor so much as a rumour of any new troubles.* Nothing could be more frivolous and void of proof, than the paper which the commons drew up on this subject."[313]

"These proceedings insinuating the design of *a new rebellion*, were founded upon very slight grounds; but there are certain subjects of so odious or unpopular a nature, that few men dare, in public assemblies, offer to stem the torrent, and speak their minds about them with freedom. *Of this nature was every motion, expressing a distrust of the Papists, and loading them with rebellious designs;* so that though the *letters which served as a foundation to their votes, were a mere contrivance and* PALPABLE FORGERY, nobody (except the lord Strabane) seems to have expressed their dissatisfaction as to the proof and truth of them, or to have made any attempt to vindicate the Papists from a charge so weakly supported, and so very improbable in the present situation of the kingdom."[314]

[313] Carte, II. 231. [314] Idem, 238.

For a full detail of this hideous state of things, which Leland appropriately styles "THE MELANCHOLY PROGRESS OF PERJURY AND SUBORNATION,"[315] the reader is referred to that writer,[316] and to the Life of the duke of Ormond.[317]

In the year 1681, there was a wonderful alarm excited in England, on the subject of an intended insurrection and massacre in Ireland.* The most terrific accounts were transmitted from the latter to the former kingdom; and warrants were issued for apprehending the supposed conspirators: but this, like so many other of the similar contrivances, already noticed, manifested as much folly as fraud. The four leaders of this tremendous conspiracy, for whom those warrants were issued, were, Richard Talbot, lord Mountgarret and his son, and a colonel Peppard.[318] Talbot was apprehended; and, being examined, there was nothing discovered that could warrant holding him in custody:[319] of lord Mountgarret's son, no further

* "January 6th, 1681. Resolved, by the lords spiritual and temporal, in Parliament assembled, that they do declare, that they are fully satisfied, that there now is, and for divers years last past hath been, a horrid and treasonable plot contrived and carried on by those of the Popish religion in Ireland, for *massacreing the English, and subverting the Protestant religion*, and the ancient established government of that kingdom; to which their lordships desire the concurrence of this house."[320]

[315] Leland, IV. 193.
[316] Idem, 188–193.
[317] Carte, II. 516, 517.
[318] Leland, IV. 185.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Memoirs of Ireland, 25.

mention is made by Leland or Carte: and, to throw the affair into complete ridicule, and display its wickedness and folly, there was no such person to be found as colonel Peppard; and lord Mountgarret, who was represented as so extremely dangerous, and so active a conspirator, was "of the age of fourscore years, bed-ridden, and in a state of dotage;"[321] most admirable qualities for a conspirator!

A considerable portion of the apparatus of this plot business consisted in the framing anonymous letters on the plan that succeeded so well against the earls Tyrone and Tyrconnel.[322] They were sometimes sent to gentlemen's houses,* sometimes dropped in the streets, and were always full of throat-cutting, conflagrations, rapes, and

* "To the worshipful and my much honoured friend Orlando Bridgman, Esq. a burgess of Parliament, at his chamber in the Inner Temple, present.

"Sir,

"We are your friends; these are to advise you to look to yourself, and to advise others of my lord Strafford's friends to take heed, lest they be included in the common calamity: our advice is, to be gone, to pretend business, till the great hubbub be past; *withdraw, lest you suffer with the Puritans:* we intreat you to send away the inclosed letter to Mr. Anderton, inclosed to some trusty friend, that it may be carried safely, without suspicion, for it concerns the common safety. So desire your friends in Covent-Garden.

"January 4th, 1641–2."[323]

[321] Leland, IV. 185. [322] Supra, 168.
[323] Nalson, II. 836.

rapine. They never failed of exciting great alarms, and were always brought forward to serve some particular purpose of the moment. Few sessions of the Irish Parliament took place, which were not marked by some of those pretended plots. We presume that we have adduced evidence enough of them, and of the execrable spirit by which they were engendered. We shall, however, as the point to be established is of vital importance, annex a few more instances, the first of which is taken from the "Memoirs of Ireland, from the Restoration,"* and slightly referred

* "Their just and terrible apprehensions were increased by a letter, dated the third of December, 1688, sent to the earl of Mount-Alexander, intimating a design of destroying the Protestants on the Sunday following. This letter was spread over the kingdom; and *one cannot conceive the horrible fright it put them all into.* The contents of it were as follow:[324]

"*A Copy of the Letter dispersed about the Massacre, said to be designed on the 9th of December*, 1688.

Decemb. 3, 1688.

"Good my lord,

"I have written to let you know, that all our Irishmen through Ireland are sworn, that on the 9th day of this month, being Sunday next, *they are to fall on*, *to kill and murther man*, *wife*, *and child*, *and to spare none;* and I desire your lordship to take care of yourself, and all others that are adjudged by our men to be heads; for whoever of them can kill any of you, is to have a captain's place. So my desire to your honour is to look to yourself, and to give other noblemen warning, and go not out at night or day without a good guard with you; and let no Irishman come near you, whatever he be. This is all from him, who is your friend and father's friend,

[324] Memoirs, 87.

to above, in page 168. With these we shall conclude this slight sketch of the odious history of letter-dropping,* forgery, and perjury.

---

One serious reflection here forces itself on the mind. How awful and deplorable must have

and will be, though I dare not be known as yet, for fear of my life.

"Direct this with care and haste

"To my lord Montgomery.[325]

"His lordship sent this letter to Dublin, with several copies of it; and copies of it were also sent to all parts of the kingdom. It arrived at Dublin on Friday, and THE DAY OF SLAUGHTER WAS TO BE TWO DAYS AFTER; the terror of which was so great amongst the English, that *about three thousand souls got away on the Saturday.* There happened to be a great many ships in the harbour at that time, and they were all so crammed, that *the passengers were in danger of being stifled.*"[326]

* "There was dropped in the streets a declaration of the Catholics of Ireland, framed upon presumption that the design had been effected, and to the like purpose as is before remembered.[327]

"The more violent attempted to drive the duke of Ormond from his course of moderate measures, by alarming him with fears of assassination. *Letters were dropped in Dublin, intimating a design of this nature, and several pretended to give an account of what they heard or suspected of this design.*"[328]

"*It had been a common artifice, just after the king's restoration*, TO DROP SUGH LETTERS IN THE STREETS AND HIGHWAYS, IN ORDER TO RENDER THE IRISH ODIOUS."[329]

[325] Memoirs, 87, King, 338. [326] Memoirs, 87.
[327] Whitelock, 47. [328] Carte, II. 481. [329] Idem, 239.

been the situation of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, forming the great mass of the nation, when their happiness, their security, nay, their liberties and their lives, lay at the mercy of any miscreant that could fabricate such letters as that sent to lord Mount-Alexander, which, according to the account of the virulent writer of the "History of Ireland, from the Restoration to the present time," set the whole kingdom in a flame! And let it be borne in mind, that every such letter, every rumour of a conspiracy, was intended to introduce, and did produce, some act to violate the rights, or depredate on the property, of those persecuted religionists.

---

We have asserted, that the witnesses were guilty of the most manifest perjury. Let us add, that the English judiciary, although so extravagantly eulogized, was then in so deplorable a state,—so lost were the judges to every sense of honour and rectitude,—and so sealed was the fate of the miserable men brought—not to trial, but condemnation, that the evidence of perjurers was received, in capital cases, and was allowed to hurry the victims to the gallows,

"With all their sins and imperfections on their heads."

The reader is requested to ponder on the following statement; and if he do not feel a holy horror at such monstrous injustice, then ought he to put this book in the fire, as unworthy of a man of his mind, and, for the rest of his life, feast

on the garbage of history to be found in Temple and Borlase,—*par nobile fratrum.*

Seven priests were indicted together at the Old Bailey, in the year 1679, for treason, in exercising their sacerdotal functions in England, contrary to the statute, which declared this a capital offence. The principal evidence against them was one Bedlow, who was, according to the testimony of Hume,[330] a nefarious villain, of the most blasted character, whose evidence should not have been taken against a notorious felon. On the trial of L. Anderson, the first of the number, Bedlow was detected, in open court, in a most manifest and flagrant perjury. He had sworn that Anderson was the son of a gentleman *in Oxfordshire*, and that HE KNEW HIM AND HIS FATHER WELL. The lord chief baron, who happened to be then in court, was acquainted with the accused, who immediately appealed to him, to prove that he was the son of a gentleman *in Lincolnshire;* which the baron accordingly testified. The case-hardened Bedlow, no ways abashed, stated *that he had his information*, as to the place of Anderson's birth, FROM MY LORD PRIVY-SEAL'S NEPHEW; notwithstanding the atrocious villain had, a few minutes before, positively sworn that he knew him well.*

* "*Bedlow.* He is a priest and an Englishman, if his mother was honest, and he honestly born: for *he is Mr. Anderson's son, of* OXFORDSHIRE, a gentleman of two or three

[330] Supra, 292.

This manifest perjury, for which, had not the chief justice been almost as wicked as the informer, Bedlow ought to have been immediately indicted, brought to the bar, tried, sentenced, and cropped, was disregarded. His evidence was received during the remainder of Anderson's trial, and against most of the rest of the unfortunate men, who were all found guilty, on the testimony of Bedlow, and other wretches, equally profligate: and, although the State Trials make no mention of the final result, as to their fate, we have reason, from the temper of the times, to presume that they were hanged.

thousand pounds a year; I KNOW HIM AND HIS FATHER VERY WELL.

"*Anderson.* My lord, could I but apprehend that I lay under so great a guilt, as to have been acquainted with *so great a rogue as this fellow is*, I would have been my own executioner, and not have expected my sentence at this bar.

"*L. C. J.* Do you know him well?

"*Bedlow.* Very well, both him and his father. *His father is an Oxfordshire gentleman.*

"*Anderson.* Now I think *I shall prove the rogue perjured.* Is my lord chief baron in the court?

"*Court.* Yes, he is.

"*Anderson.* Why then my father has the honour of being well known to his lordship, who knows this to be false.

"*L. C. Baron.* No, no, Mr. Bedlow: *he is a gentleman's son of quality in* LINCOLNSHIRE.

"*L. C. J.* You are mistaken, you are mistaken; *his father is a* LINCOLNSHIRE *gentleman.*

"*Anderson.* And yet this rogue is upon his oath; but indeed all his life is full of such mistakes.

"*Bedlow.* I don't know. *My lord Privy-Seal's nephew told me so!!!*"[331]

[331] State Trials, VII. 839.

Who can read this statement without horror? Who can regard otherwise than as a mere slaughter-house, a court of justice, where, on the trial of a number of men for their lives, merely for the worship of the Living God, the judge acts the part of the public accuser;* where the witnesses for the accused are almost torn to pieces by the mob;† and where the evidence is unhesitatingly received, of a wretch whose perjury is as clear as the noon-day sun; who is caught *flagrante delicto;* and whose confession of the hideous crime is made in open court,—a wretch on whom

"Sin, death, and hell had set their marks."[332]

The reader may inquire, why these facts are here adduced, as few of them occurred in Ireland,

* "*The chief justice gave sanction to all the narrow prejudices and bigoted fury of the populace.* Instead of being counsel for the prisoners, as his office required, HE PLEADED THE CAUSE AGAINST THEM; *browbeat their witnesses; and on every occasion represented their guilt as certain and uncontroverted.*"[333]

† "When verdict was given against the prisoner, the spectators expressed their savage joy, by loud acclamations. The witnesses, on approaching the court, *were almost torn in pieces* by the rabble. One, in particular, was bruised to such a degree *as to put his life in danger:* and another, a woman, declared that, unless the court could afford her protection, she durst not give evidence. But as the judges could" [would, more properly] "go no farther than promise to punish such as should do her any injury, the prisoner himself had the humanity to wave her testimony."[334]

[332] Shakspeare. [333] Hume, IV. 329. [334] Idem, 342.

and most of them were not cotemporaneous with the events we develop? He shall be satisfied. We wish, as we have stated at the commencement of this chapter, to establish, beyond the power of controversy, the prevailing spirit of the age, in fostering and rewarding perjury, forgery, and the fabrication of pretended plots, not only during, but previous and subsequent to, the period most particularly included in these investigations; in order to prepare the reader for a candid discussion of the pretended plot of 1641, the existence of which is so universally credited, that it requires a most extraordinary degree of liberality, even to suspend the operation of, and much more to eradicate, the inveterate prejudices that prevail on the subject.

## CHAPTER XV.

*The insurrection in 1641. Was there a general conspiracy of the Irish, in that year, to murder the Protestants?*

THE decision of this question is attended with far more difficulty than any of those which we have heretofore presented to the view of the reader. The nature of the case does not admit of the same kind of evidence as we have been enabled to produce, and which, we flatter ourselves, has been found irresistible.

But the tale of this conspiracy has been so universally credited; so large a portion of the possessors of confiscated property in Ireland have been interested in affording it support and countenance; so much art and talent have been, for a hundred and seventy years, employed in giving it an air of plausibility; there is so much difficulty in proving a negative in any case, more particularly in the present one, which is naturally, and has been moreover artfully, involved in mystery; and it is so extremely arduous an undertaking, to operate upon the public mind, when imbued with inveterate prejudices, that we regard the task as Herculean, and should have

abandoned it as impracticable, but that the narrative itself is replete with so many incredible and incongruous circumstances, as to carry strong internal evidence of fraud.

In order to give the story fair play, and to enable the reader to form a correct opinion on the subject, with all the evidence before him, we shall give the whole account of the discovery of the plot, as it stands in Temple's History of the Irish Rebellion, the authority almost solely relied on by all the other writers on the subject. We add some slight extracts from Borlase, containing a few additional particulars.

To simplify the examination, we have divided the whole into short sentences, each containing perfect sense, so as to oblige the reader to pause and reflect, as he proceeds.

This point being the main one we have in view in this work, we earnestly invoke the reader's calm and candid consideration of it. We hope that, laying aside all preconceived opinions on the subject, he will revolve it in his mind, as if it were wholly new, and he had now, for the first time in his life, to form a decision on it. We are aware that there are too many to whom a compliance with this request is impossible: and indeed a large proportion of mankind can never command independence of mind enough even to examine the evidence that militates with their early, and, of course, inveterate, prejudices; far less to reject those prejudices. We are therefore

persuaded, there are thousands who would as soon doubt any of the demonstrations of Euclid, or the existence of the solar system, as the existence of the universality of the plot of "*the execrable rebellion of* 1641."

To this contracted class we do not address ourselves: with them we have no fellowship: "Even though one were to rise from the dead," he would not remove their incredulity. Let them hug the chains of their bigoted prejudice. We appeal to that respectable description of readers, whose minds are open to conviction, and who are at all times ready to yield to the force of evidence, how strongly soever it may militate against those opinions that have "grown with their growth." The favourable decision of one such reader, with a clear head and sound heart, would outweigh the disapprobation of a whole army of the slaves of prejudice.

*Extracts from Temple's History of the Irish Rebellion.**

1. "Sir William Cole, upon the very first apprehensions of something that he conceived to be hatching among the Irish, did write a letter to the lords justices and council, dated the 11th of October, 1641,

2. "Wherein he gave them notice of the great resort made to Sir Phelim O'Neal, in the county of Tyrone, *as also to the house of the lord Macguire*, in the county of Fermanagh, and that by several suspected persons, fit instruments for mischief;

* The reader will please to observe, that these extracts are taken *verbatim* from the original work; and, unless where otherwise distinctly marked, form an unbroken consecutive series.

3. " As also that *the said lord Macguire had of late made several journies into the Pale and other places, and had spent his time much in writing letters and sending despatches abroad.*

4. " *These letters were received* by the lords justices and council;

5. " And they, in answer to them, required him to be very vigilant and industrious to find out what should be the occasion of these several meetings, and speedily to advertise them thereof, or of any other particular that he conceived might tend to the public service of the state."[335]

1. " They [the lords justices] had not any certain notice of the general conspiracy of the Irish, until the 22d of October, in the very evening before the day appointed for the surprise of the castle of Dublin.

2. " The conspirators being, many of them, arrived within the city, and having that day met at the Lion tavern, in Copper alley, and there turning the drawer out of the room, ordered their affairs together, drunk healths upon their knees to the happy success of the next morning's work.

3. " Owen O'Conally, *a gentleman of a mere Irish family*, but one that had long lived among the English, and been trained up in the true Protestant religion, came unto the lord justice Parsons, ABOUT NINE O'CLOCK THAT EVENING!!

4. " And made him a broken relation of a great conspiracy for the seizing upon his majesty's castle of Dublin.

5. " *He gave him the names of some of the chief conspirators!* assured him that they were come up expressly to the town for the same purpose, and that next morning they would undoubtedly attempt, and surely effect it, if their design were not speedily prevented;

6. " And that he had understood all this from Hugh MacMahon, one of the chief conspirators, who was then in town, and came up *but the very same afternoon*, for the execution of the plot;

7. " And with whom indeed *he had been drinking somewhat liberally;* and as the truth is, did then make such a broken rela-

[335] Temple, 18.

tion of a matter that *seemed so incredible in itself*, as that his lordship *gave very little belief to it at first!*

8. "In regard *it came from an obscure person*, and one, as he conceived, somewhat distempered at that time.

9. "But howsoever, the lord Parsons gave him order *to go again to Mac-Mahon!!! and get out of him as much certainty of the plot!!!* with as many particular circumstances, as he could!!! straitly charging him to return back unto him the same evening!!!

10. "And in the mean time, having by strict commands given to the constable of the castle, taken order *to have the gates thereof well guarded, as also with the mayor and sheriffs of the city to have* strong watches set upon all parts of the same, and to make stay of all strangers,

11. "He went *privately!!* about ten of the clock that night, to the lord Borlace's house without the town, and there acquainted him with what he understood from O'Conally.

12. "They sent for such of the council as they knew then to be in the town.

13. "But there came only unto them that night sir Thomas Rotheram and sir Robert Meredith, chancellour of the exchequer: with these *they fell into consultation what was fit to be done!!!!* attending the return of O'Conally.

14. "And finding that he staid somewhat longer than the time prefixed, they sent out in search after him;

15. "And found him seized on by the watch, and so he had been carried away to prison, and the discovery that night disappointed,

16. "Had not one of the lord Parsons' servants, expressly sent, amongst others, to walk the streets, and attend the motion of the said O'Conally, come in, and rescued him, and brought him to the lord Borlace's house.

17. "O'Conally having somewhat recovered himself from his distemper, occasioned partly, as he said himself, by the horror of the plot revealed to him, partly by his too liberal drinking with Mac-Mahon, that he might the more easily get away from him, (he beginning much to suspect and fear his discovery of the plot,)

18. "Confirmed what he had formerly related, and added these farther particulars set down in his examination, as followeth :[336]

*The Examination of Owen O'Conally, gentleman, taken before us, whose names ensue, October* 22, 1641.

"Who, being duly sworn and examined, saith :

1. "That he being at *Monimore*, in the county of Londonderry on *Tuesday last!* he received a letter from colonel Hugh Oge Mac-Mahon, desiring him to come to Conaught, in the county of Monaghan, and to be with him on *Wednesday* or *Thursday* last!

2. "Whereupon he, this examinate, came to Conaught, on Wednesday night last;

3. "And finding the said Hugh come to Dublin, followed him hither;

4. "He came hither about *six of the clock this evening!*

5. "And forthwith went to the lodging of the said Hugh, to the house near the Boat, in Oxmantown;

6. "And there he found the same Hugh, and came with the said Hugh *into the town*, near the Pillory, to the lodging of the lord Macguire;

7. "Where they found not the lord within; and there they drank a cup of beer;

8. "And *then went back again* to the said Hugh his lodging;

9. "He saith, that at the lord Macguire his lodging, the said Hugh told him that there were and would be this night great numbers of noblemen, and gentlemen of the Irish Papists, from all the parts of the kingdom, in this town;

10. "Who with himself had determined to take the castle of Dublin, and possess themselves of all his majesty's ammunition there, *to-morrow morning*, being Saturday;

11. "And that they intended first to batter the chimnies of the said town: and if the city would not yield, then to batter down the houses;

12. "And so *to cut off all the Protestants* that would not join with them!

[336] Temple, 19.

13. " He further saith, that the said Hugh then told him, that the Irish had prepared men in all parts of the kingdom, *to destroy all the English inhabiting there, to-morrow morning, by ten of the clock!!*

14. " And that in all the sea-ports, and other towns in the kingdom, *all the Protestants should be killed this night!!* and that all the posts that could be, could not prevent it;

15. " And further saith, that he moved the said Hugh to forbear executing of that business, and to discover it to the state, for the saving of his own estate;

16. " Who said he could not help it; but said, that they did owe their allegiance to the king, and would pay him all his rights: but that they did this for the tyrannical government was over them, and to imitate Scotland, who got a privilege by that course;

17. " And he further saith, that when he was with the said Hugh, in his lodging the second time, the said Hugh swore, that he should not go out of his lodging that night, but told him that he should go with him the next morning to the castle: and said, if this matter were discovered, some body should die for it;

18. " Whereupon this examinate feigned some necessity for his easement, went down out of the chamber, and left his sword in pawn: and the said Hugh sent his man down with him, and when this examinate came down into the yard, and finding an opportunity, he, this examinate, *leaped over a wall and two pales!!!* and so came to the lord justice Parsons.

" October 22, 1641.

William Parsons.
Thomas Rotheram.
Robert Meredith.
Owen O'Conally."[337]

19. " *Hereupon the lords took present order to have a watch privately set upon the lodging of Mac-Mahon, as also upon the lord Macguire!!!!!*

20. " And so they sat up all that night in *consultation!!!* having far stronger *presumptions* upon this latter examination taken, than any ways at first they could entertain.

[337] Temple, 20.

21. "The lords justices, upon a further consideration, there being come unto them *early next morning!* several others of the privy council, *sent before day, and seized upon Mac-Mahon*, then with his servant in his own lodging.

22. "They at first made some little resistance with their drawn swords; but, finding themselves overmastered, presently yielded.

23. "And so they were brought before the lords justices and council, still sitting at the lord Borlace's house.

24. "Where, upon examination, he did without much difficulty confess the plot, resolutely telling them, that *on that very day, all the forts and strong places in Ireland would be taken!!*

25. "That he, with the lord Macguire, Hugh Birn, captain Brian O'Neil, and several other Irish gentlemen, were come up expressly to surprise the castle of Dublin.

26. "That *twenty men out of each county in the kingdom!!!* were to be here to join with them.

27. "That *all the lords and gentlemen in the kingdom, that were Papists, were engaged in this plot!!!*

28. "That what was *that day to be done in other parts of the country*, was so far advanced by that time, as it was impossible for the wit of man to prevent it!

29. "And withal told them, that it was true they had him in their power, and might use him how they pleased; but he was sure he should be revenged."[338]

---

1. Extract from "The lords chief justices' letter to the lord lieutenant, October 25th, 1641, sent by Owen O'Conally, the first discoverer.

"May it please your lordship,

2. "On Friday, the 22d of this month, *after nine o'clock at night*, this bearer, Owen O'Conally, SERVANT TO SIR JOHN CLOTWORTHY, KNIGHT, came to me, the lord justice Parsons, to my house,

3. "And in great secresie (as indeed the cause did require) discovered unto me a most wicked and damnable conspiracy, plotted, contrived, and intended to be also acted by some evil-affected Irish Papists here.

[338] Temple, 21.

4. "The plot was on the then next morning, Saturday, the 23d of October, being St. Ignatius's day, *about nine of the clock!* to surprize his majestie's castle of Dublin, his majestie's chief strength of this kingdom; wherein also is the principal magazine of his majestie's arms and munition.

5. "And it was agreed, it seems, among them, that at the same hour, *all other his majestie's forts and magazines of arms and munition in this kingdom!!* should be surprized by others of those conspirators:

6. "And further, *that all the Protestants and English throughout the whole kingdom*, that would not join with them, should be cut off!! and so those Papists should then become possessed of the government and kingdom at the same instant.

7. "As soon as I had that intelligence, I then immediately repaired to the lord justice Borlace; and thereupon *we instantly assembled the council.*

8. "And *having sate all that night!!!* also all the next day, the 23d of October, in regard of the short time left us for the consultation of so great and weighty a matter, although it was not possible for us, upon so few hours' warning, to prevent those other great mischiefs which were to be acted, even at the same hour and at so great a distance, in all the other parts of the kingdom.

9. "Yet such was our industry therein, *having caused the castle to be that night strengthened with armed men*, and the city guarded, as the wicked councils of those evil persons, by the great mercy of God to us, became defeated, so as they were not able to act that part of their treachery, which indeed was principal,

10. "And which, if they could have effected, would have rendered the rest of their purposes the more easy.

11. "Having so secured the castle, we forthwith laid about for the apprehension of as many of the offenders as we could, many of them having come to this city but that night, intending, it seems, the next morning, to act their parts in those treacherous and bloody crimes.

12. "The first man apprehended was one Hugh Mac-Mahon, Esq. (grandson to the traitor Tyrone) a gentleman of good fortune in the county of Monaghan, who, with others,

WAS TAKEN THAT MORNING in Dublin, having, at the time of their apprehension, offered a little resistance with their swords drawn; but finding those we employed against them more in number, and better armed, yielded.

13. "He, upon examination before us, at first denied all; but in the end, when he saw we laid it home to him, he confessed enough to destroy himself, and impeach some others, as by a copy of his examinations herewith sent, may appear to your lordship.

14. "We then committed him till we might have further time to examine him again, our time being become more needful to be employed in action for securing this place, than examining. This Mac-Mahon had been abroad, and served the king of Spain as a lieutenant-colonel.

15. "Upon conference with him and others!!! *and calling to mind a letter we received the week before* from Sir William Cole!!! a copy whereof we send your lordship here inclosed, we gathered, that *the lord Macguire was to be an actor in surprizing the castle of Dublin!!!!!*

16. "Wherefore we held it necessary to secure him immediately, thereby also to startle and deter the rest, when they found him laid fast"[339]

*Extracts from Borlace's "History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion."*

1. "In the interim, the lord Parsons, (being touched with the relation,) repaired, about ten of the clock at night, to the lord Borlace, at Chichester house, without the town,

2. "And disclosed to him what O'Conally had imparted; which made so sensible an impression on his colleague, as (the discoverer being let go) he grew infinitely concerned thereat, having none to punish, if the story should prove false, or means to learn more, were it true.

3. "In the disturbance of which perplexity, Owen O'Conally comes (or, as others write, was brought) where the lords justices were then met; sensible that his discovery was not

[339] Temple, 28.

thoroughly believed, professing that whatever he had acquainted the lord Parsons with (touching the conspiracy) was true:

4. "And could he but repose himself, *(the effects of drink being still upon him)* he should discover more.

5. "Whereupon *he had the conveniency of a bed.*"[340]

---

6. "In the interim, the lords justices summoned as many of the council as they could give notice to, to their assistance that night at Chichester house.

7. "Sir Thomas Rotheram, and Sir Robert Meredith, chancellor of the exchequer, came immediately to them.

8. "They then with all diligence secured the gates of the city, with such as they could most confide in, and strengthened the warders of the castle, (which were a few inconsiderable men,) with their foot guard, usually attending their persons, *charging the mayor and his brethren to be watchful of all persons that should walk the streets that night!!!*"[341]

---

9. "Hugh Oge Mac-Mahon, Esqr. grandson by his mother to the traitor Tir-Owen, a gentleman of good fortune in the county of Monaghan, who had served as a lieutenant-colonel in the king of Spain's quarters, was, after some little resistance, apprehended *before day in his own lodgings*, over the water, near the Inns, and brought to Chichester house;

10. "Where, upon examination, he did, without much difficulty, confess the plot, resolutely telling them, That ON THAT VERY DAY, *(it was now about five in the morning, the 23d of Oct.* 1641*!!!)* that all the forts and strong places in Ireland would be taken," &c. &c.[342]

---

11. "Before Mac-Mahon was apprehended, O'Conally, having *on his repose* recovered himself, had his examination taken, in these words:"[343] [as before.]

340 Borlace, 20. 341 Ibid. 342 Ibid. 343 Ibid.

## ANALYSIS OF THE FOREGOING LEGEND.

I. A Roman Catholic colonel is engaged in a plot, the object of which is *to massacre all the Protestants in the kingdom*, except those who would join in murdering their brethren.

II. This colonel, in want of a confederate, sends about fifty miles to O'Conally, *a Protestant*, to reveal to him this project.

III. O'Conally, who, in order to attach importance to his testimony, in some of the statements is styled "a gentleman," is, in fact and in truth, merely a servant to Sir John Clotworthy, *one of the most envenomed enemies of the Roman Catholics*, and, of course, a very suitable person to be entrusted with such a secret, and very worthy to be sent for to a place distant fifty miles.

IV. O'Conally receives the letter on *Tuesday*, the 19th of October, at what hour is not known, —say nine o'clock; and, *wholly ignorant of the nature of the affair* which leads to the invitation, makes all his preparations at once, and commences his journey, we will suppose, about noon the same day.

V. He arrives, *on Wednesday night*, the 20th, at Conaught, after a journey of about fifty miles: and be it observed, *en passant*, that a journey of fifty miles, at that period, was as arduous an undertaking, and required full as much preparation, as a journey of two hundred miles at present.

VI. Colonel Mac-Mahon, who had given him the option of coming on Wednesday OR *Thursday*, so far broke his engagement, that he had started, *on Wednesday*, for Dublin, previous to O'Conally's arrival, which took place on the night of that day.

VII. O'Conally, nothing discouraged by the breach of engagement on the part of the colonel, follows him to Dublin.

VIII. He arrives in that city on the memorable Friday, the 22d of October, at six o'clock in the evening, ONE HOUR AFTER SUNSET.

IX. Monimore, where O'Conally received the friendly invitation to the throat-cutting party, appears, by Pinkerton's map, to be about ninety-three miles in a direct line from Dublin, and was probably a hundred and ten, or a hundred and twenty, by the usual circuitous windings of the road,—we will suppose only a hundred and ten.

X. Conaught, in Monaghan, is not to be found on any map. Its distance from the extreme points cannot therefore be ascertained; and, being left to range in the fields of conjecture, we will venture to suppose it was nearly mid-way, or fifty miles.

XI. The climate of Ireland is very moist. Rains are generally abundant, particularly in autumn. Of course, *the roads at that season were very probably miry, and difficult to travel.*

XII. It thus appears, that O'Conally has performed a journey of about fifty miles in a day and a half; that is, from mid-day on Tuesday, to Wednesday night; and a hundred and ten in three days and a half, at a season of the year, when THE SUN ROSE ABOUT SEVEN, AND SET ABOUT FIVE; and this exploit was accomplished at a time when there were no diligences, or post-coaches, or post-chaises, or steam-boats, to ensure expedition; and when, moreover, the roads were, as we have stated, in all probability in very bad order.

XIII. Nothing discouraged by the fatigue of his journey of a hundred and ten miles, nor by his previous disappointment, nor by the darkness of the evening, he commences a search for the lodgings of an entire stranger. And let it not be forgotten, that on this night *the moon was invisible*,* a circumstance admirably calculated to aid his researches!

* *Extract of a Letter from the Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania.*

"January 6, 1819.

"Dear Sir,

"I find that it was *New Moon*, at Dublin, at about two o'clock in the morning of the 24th of October, 1641, O. S. Consequently the moon must have been *invisible* on the whole night of the 22d–23d of that month.

"Yours, &c.

"R. M. PATTERSON.

"MR. M. CAREY."

XIV. *Instinct* is a most valuable quality, and supplies the want of the most important senses: and the "*servant*," or "*gentleman*," aided by instinct, discovered, *in the suburbs*, the lodgings of the colonel; as Sir John Falstaff, "*by instinct*," discovered the mad-cap prince of Wales.

XV. Although the colonel was engaged in "a good plot, and full of expectation," to explode *on Saturday, at ten o'clock, A. M.* O'Conally finds him alone *at or about six o'clock on Friday evening*, *in the suburbs*, and appears to have seen none of his brother conspirators until nine, at which time O'Conally left him.

XVI. The colonel takes him to the lodgings of a brother conspirator "*into town*," at the distance, probably, of a mile or two.

XVII. This conspirator not being at home, the colonel, after having taken a drink of beer with his new friend, freely communicates "that there were and would be, this night, great numbers of noblemen and gentlemen of the Irish, from all parts of the kingdom," whose object was "*to cut off all the Protestants that would not join them.*"[344]

XVIII. And they then went back to "*the said Hugh his lodgings*," in the suburbs, "near Oxmantown," where O'Conally drank himself beastly drunk.

XIX. O'Conally, notwithstanding this temporary derangement in his pericranium, and that

[344] Temple, 20.

he was, two hours afterwards, unable to relate a consistent story, was alert enough to "leap over a wall," and afterwards "over two pales," which was a very remarkable exploit, for a man who had poured out so many libations to Bacchus.

"I have seen drunkards do more than this in sport."[345]

XX. He found his way, "by instinct," probably, to Sir William Parsons, *into the town*, to whom he communicated the whole affair.

XXI. Here let us observe, by way of a parenthesis, that this very Sir William had received information of a plot, several days before, from Sir William Cole, "*upon the very first apprehension of something that he conceived to be hatching among the Irish*."[346]

XXII. And further, that this lord justice had written to Sir William Cole, "to be very vigilant in inquiring into the occasion of those meetings;"[347] whereby it appears that he had suspicions of a conspiracy.

XXIII. Notwithstanding this information, Sir William Parsons, who was jealous of some plot "hatching among the Irish;" who, of course, ought to be on the *qui vive*, and to take alarm on the slightest intimation of any scheme of that kind; receiving this "broken relation of a matter *so incredible in itself*," his lordship "*gave very little belief to it at first*, in regard it came from an obscure person, and one, as he conceived, *somewhat distempered* at that time."[348]

[345] Shakspeare. [346] Temple, 18. [347] Ibid. [348] Ibid.

XXIV. "His lordship," with most wonderful sagacity, "hearing this broken relation" of a plot, to explode in about twelve or thirteen hours, for the purpose of cutting the throats of all the Protestants, and his own very valuable throat among the rest, sends the informer!! between nine and ten at night!! with "order to go again to Mac-Mahon, and get out of him as much certainty of the plot as he could!!!"[349]

XXV. This informer, being so drunk, as we have stated, that, in an hour or two afterwards, he was unable to make a deposition, without letting "sleep, with her leaden and batty wings, creep over him," was therefore *a most admirable spy to make further discoveries!!!*

XXVI. After sending O'Conally to Mac-Mahon's lodgings, with strict orders "to return back unto him the same evening," Sir William went "*privately*, at about ten of the clock that night, to lord Borlase's house, WITHOUT THE TOWN,"[350] whereas O'Conally was directed to come to him at his house WITHIN THE TOWN.

XXVII. "They sent for such of the council as they knew then to be IN THE TOWN," to lord Borlase's house, "WITHOUT THE TOWN."[351]

XXVIII. There they fell into deep consultation "what was fit to be done, attending the *return* of O'Conally."[352]

349 Temple, 19. 350 Ibid. 351 Ibid. 352 Ibid.

XXIX. They then sent in search of him, and found that he had been taken by the watch, and rescued by the servants of Sir William Parsons, "who had been sent, amongst others, to walk the streets, and attend his motions."[353]

XXX. "Sensible that his discovery was not thoroughly believed, he professed that whatever he had acquainted the lord Parsons with, was true; and could he but repose himself, (the effects of drink being still upon him) he should discover more."[354]

XXXI. "*Whereupon, he had the conveniency of a bed.*"[355]

XXXII. "Having (on his repose) *recovered himself*," he gave in his deposition.

XXXIII. This is dated the 22d, and of course must have been made before twelve o'clock.

XXXIV. This deposition gave a full detail of a most murderous plot, whereby "*all the Protestants and English, throughout the whole kingdom, were to be cut off the next morning.*"

XXXV. Possessed of this deposition, which required the most decisive measures of prevention, it becomes a serious question, what did the lords justices do? On this point the whole merits of the question might be rested: and indeed the investigation of any other might be wholly omitted. The answer to the above question is, "*They took present order to have a watch pri-*

[353] Temple, 19. [354] Borlace, 20. [355] Ibid.

*vately set upon the lodgings of Mac-Mahon, as also upon the lord Macguire!!!*"

XXXVI. In a plain, simple case, in which a school-boy of ten years old could have at once pointed out the course to be pursued, they spend no less than *five precious hours* "*in consultation*," and in devising ways and means for the public safety, notwithstanding that the sword, not of Damocles, but of Mac-Mahon and his bloody-minded associates, hung over them. "They sate up all that night in consultation," "having far stronger presumptions, upon the latter examination taken, than any ways at first they could entertain."[356]

XXXVII. The result of their long and painful consultation, from twelve o'clock at night till five in the morning, was, that at that late hour, they at length adopted the resolution of apprehending Mac-Mahon!!!!!!

XXXVIII. The lords justices had received the names of some of the principal conspirators from O'Conally, and, among the rest, of lord Macguire; had *privately set a watch*, on Friday night, at his lodgings: they must of course have known that he was equally implicated with Mac-Mahon, and equally demanded the exercise of their vigilance; and yet they did not think of arresting him, until after the seizure of the latter, and "a conference with him and others, and *calling to mind a letter*

[356] Temple, 21.

*received the week before from Sir William Cole,*" they "gathered" that he "was to be an actor in surprising the castle of Dublin."[357]

XXXIX. Owen O'Conally swears, that in all parts of the kingdom, "all the English inhabiting there," are to be destroyed "*to-morrow morning;*" but, in the very next sentence, he swears, "that all the Protestants, in all the seaports and other towns in the kingdom, should be killed *this night.*" It is not easy to conceive, how, after they were "*all killed*" on Friday night, they could be "*all destroyed*" on Saturday morning.

XL. O'Conally's deposition states, that the massacre is to begin at ten o'clock on the 23d; to be general in all the parts of the kingdom; that all the English inhabitants are to be cut off; and that all the posts that could be, could not prevent it. As this is the cardinal point in the affair, on which the whole turns, if it can be proved to be so unequivocally false and groundless, as to be utterly destitute of even the shadow of truth, then is the entire story a fabrication, and O'Conally a perjurer.

XLI. That this explosion did not take place; and that, of course, there could not possibly have been a general conspiracy, we have superabundant testimony, as will appear in the subsequent paragraphs.

[357] Temple, 28.

XLII. We will first premise, that, as the arrest of Mac-Mahon and Macguire, in consequence of the pretended discovery of the sham plot, took place on the 23d of October, *at five o'clock in the morning*, just five hours before the time fixed for commencing the massacre, that circumstance could not have prevented an explosion in any other part of the kingdom, except in a very small portion of the circumjacent vicinity.

XLIII. Yet on Monday, the 25th of October, the lords justices wrote an elaborate and detailed account of the proceedings of the insurgents in the north of Ireland, with a prolix statement of various outrages, not only without the least hint or surmise, but even an utter exclusion of every idea, of murder or shedding of blood.*

* In the despatch above referred to, dated October 25th, the lords justices, after having given an account of sundry outrages perpetrated by the insurgents in Ulster, without a word respecting bloodshed, add, "*And this, though too much, is all that we yet hear is done by them.*"[358] This sentence, and the declaration in the proclamation of the 29th, that the insurrection was confined to "such of the mere old Irish in the province of Ulster, as have plotted, contrived, and been actors in this treason, and others who adhere to them," set the broad seal of condemnation and flagrant falsehood on the murderous part of O'Conally's deposition; and it is unnecessary to add, that when the main point of a story is proven to be false, the whole may be pronounced to be

"Lies, like the father that begets them,
"Gross as a mountain."[359]

[358] Temple, 30. [359] Shakspeare.

XLIV. And further, we invoke the most earnest attention of the reader to this all-important fact:—Notwithstanding the pretended generality of the plot, the lords justices, by public proclamation, on the 29th of October, declared, that the insurrection was confined to "the mere old Irish of the province of Ulster, and others who adhered to them;" and that *they were well assured of the fidelity of the old English of the Pale, and of the other parts of the kingdom.**

XLV. These two strong facts prove that such parts of O'Conally's deposition as relate to the general extent of the conspiracy, and the plot to "cut off all the Protestants throughout the kingdom," are wholly false, and that he of course was an abandoned perjurer; and would decide the question on these vital points, beyond appeal or controversy. But much stronger evidence

* *Extract from a Proclamation by the Lords Justices of Ireland, dated October* 29, 1641.

* "We do hereby declare and publish, to all his majestie's good subjects in this kingdom, that by the words 'Irish Papists,' we intended only such of the old mere Irish in the province of Ulster, as have plotted, contrived, and been actors in this treason, and others who adhere to them;

"And that we do not any way intend or mean thereby any of the old English of the Pale, nor of *any other parts of this kingdom:*

"WE BEING WELL ASSURED OF THEIR FIDELITY TO THE CROWN, and having experience of the good affections of their ancestors in former times of danger and rebellion."[360]

[360] Temple, 34.

remains behind, derived from Temple, Borlase, Carte, Leland, and Warner, to which we now invite the attention of the reader.

XLVI. Munster *continued tranquil for six weeks*, although, according to the testimony of Warner, *it contained but one troop of horse:** and of course, when defended by such an insignificant force, had there been any reality in the plot, the Irish could and would have totally overwhelmed their oppressors.†

* "In the province of Munster, of which Sir William St. Leger was lord president, the English were very numerous, and ready to assemble in a body to preserve the peace of the country. But they were utterly destitute of arms: and all the solicitations made by Sir William, which were strong and numerous, could not persuade the lords justices and council to spare him any. He was a brave old soldier, of great experience and ability; and did every thing that it was possible for a man to do *with one troop of horse, which was all his guard for the whole province;* a guard scarcely sufficient to repress the insolence of robbers, in a time of profound peace, much less in a time of such general spoil and disturbance. But, with the assistance of the noblemen and gentry of the province, *it continued quiet for above six weeks!!!* Indeed, no man of quality, or gentleman of English blood, either Papist or Protestant, had as yet joined the rebels."[361]

† There is a discrepancy between Temple and Borlase as to the time when the insurrection commenced in Munster; the former dating it "the beginning," and the latter "the midst," of December. This does not, however, affect the disproof of O'Conally's deposition, which, in either case, is notoriously false.

"The flame having marched through Ulster and Leinster, it discovers its fury, *about the beginning of December*, 1641, in

[361] Warner, 130.

## XLVII. Connaught was in the same state for six weeks, principally owing to the influence of lord Clanrickarde, a Roman Catholic.*

Munster, which province till that time (by the moderation of the state) had stifled its rage, then expressing its consent with the other provinces."[362]

"The whole province of Munster, *about the midst of this month of December*, BEGAN to declare themselves in open rebellion."[363]

"In Munster, Sir William St. Leger, the lord president, a soldier of activity and experience, and possessed even with an inveteracy against the Irish, could not obtain arms or soldiers sufficient for a time of peace, much less *for a juncture of distraction and disorder.* Yet the strength of the English Protestants, and *the loyalty of the Irish gentry, as yet preserved this province from any material disorder.*"[364]

* "The lord Ranelagh was president of Connaught: and all that province, except a few pillagers in the county of Sligo, had, owing in a great measure to the forward zeal and activity of lord Clanrickarde, though a Roman Catholic, till this time continued quiet."[365]

"The infection of the Pale having spread in the remoter parts, *about the middle of December*, the whole province of Connaught in a manner revolted, the county of Galway, of which lord Clanrickarde was governor, excepted."[366]

"The peace and security of Connaught were equally neglected by the chief governors, although *the English power was inconsiderable in this province*, and the Irish natives kept in continual alarm for twenty-five years, by the prospect of a general plantation, which, though suspended, had not been formally relinquished. *Yet here, too, the good affections of the principal inhabitants stemmed the torrent of rebellion.*"[367]

[362] Borlace, 49. [363] Temple, 155. [364] Leland, III. 158.
[365] Warner, 157. [366] Idem, 158. [367] Leland, III. 158.

XLVIII. Leinster was likewise tranquil, except some outrages of small importance, until the beginning of December; as the summons to the lords of the Pale to come to Dublin, to consult on the affairs of state, was dated the 3d of that month, at which time there was no appearance of serious disturbance; and the butchery at Santry, by the sanguinary and merciless ruffian, Sir Charles Coote,* which was obviously intended to provoke, and actually led to, the insurrection in that province, took place on the 7th.

XLIX. And further, we have the testimony of Warner and Carte,† that the insurrection was *for*

* "The town being left at his [Sir Charles Coote's] mercy, *to which he appears to be a stranger*, he put to death several persons, *without distinction of age or sex!!!* in revenge of the several spoils committed on the English in those parts."[368]

"In revenge of their depredations, he [Sir Charles Coote] committed *such unprovoked, such ruthless, and indiscriminate carnage* in the town, as rivalled the utmost extravagancies of the Northerns."[369]

"The town being left to his [Sir Charles Coote's] mercy, he, in revenge of the spoils committed upon the English, put, *without distinction of sex!!!* several persons to death."[370]

† "Had the lords justices and council acquitted themselves like men of probity and understanding, there was time enough given them to suppress an insurrection *which for six weeks was confined almost to the province of Ulster*, without any chief that was so considerable as Sir Phelim O'Neal."[371]

"*No one nobleman of the kingdom, nor any estated gentleman of English race*, engaged in the rebellion, or joined with the rebels in action, *till the month of December;* for as to those

368 Warner, 135.
369 Leland, III. 168.
370 Carte, I. 242.
371 Warner, 130.

*about six weeks* confined almost wholly to the province of Ulster.

L. That the original views of the insurgents did not comprehend a general massacre, or even single murders, we have further testimony, clear and decisive, derived from Temple, Warner, and Leland, which, independent of all other proof, would be sufficient to settle this question for ever, and utterly overwhelm O'Conally's perjured legend.*

LI. Moreover, if there had been a plot for a general insurrection, and such a massacre

gentlemen of the county of Louth, who submitted to them before, being unable to defend themselves or to make resistance, they had not yet appeared in action. *The rebellion till then had been carried on by the mere Irish*, and CONFINED TO ULSTER, *to some few counties in Leinster, and that of Leitrim, in Connaught.*"[372]

* "Their first intention went no farther than to strip the English and the Protestants of their power and possessions; and, unless forced to it by opposition, *not to shed any blood.*"[373]

"It was resolved" by the insurgents "*not to kill any*, but where of necessity they should be forced thereunto by opposition."[374]

"Resistance produced some bloodshed: and, in some instances, private revenge, religious hatred, and the suspicion of some valuable concealment, enraged the triumphant rebels to insolence, cruelty, and murder. So far, however, was the ORIGINAL SCHEME of the conspiracy" [mark well these words: —*the original scheme of the conspiracy*] "at first pursued, that *few fell by the sword, except in open war and assault.*"[375]

[372] Carte, I. 243.
[373] Warner, 47.
[374] Temple, 65.
[375] Leland, III. 137.

as O'Conally swore to, there would have been some evidence produced from some of the conspirators: but notwithstanding the lords justices had recourse to the execrable aid of the rack, and put Mac-Mahon and others to the torture,* there is not, in the examinations of the former, a single word to corroborate the cut-throat part of O'Conally's deposition. The examinations of the rest were never published.

LII. There is not to be found in Temple, nor Borlase, nor Carte, nor Warner, nor Leland, nor Clarendon, nor, as far as we have seen, in Rushworth, the examination of a single person engaged in a conspiracy which was said to extend throughout the whole kingdom, except those of Mac-Mahon and lord Macguire! That of the latter was not taken till March, 1642.

* "The first person PUT TO THE RACK, was Mac-Mahon; whom the reader must remember to have been taken on O'Conally's information, when the conspiracy was discovered. I copied his examination from the bishop of Clogher's MSS. in the College Library: and on that examination, *he had nothing but hearsay evidence to give;* which amounts only to his *having been told* that lord Macguire, Sir P. O'Neil, and Philip O'Reilly, were the chief conspirators; that all the chief Papists in Parliament last summer, knew and approved of the rebellion; that the committee then employed in England would procure an order from the king to proceed in their rebellious courses; that *he was told*, last October, that the king had given a commision to seize all the garrisons and strong holds; but he doth not say, he ever saw such a commission."[376]

[376] Warner, 176.

Perhaps the preceding analysis of this miserable legend might supersede the necessity of adding any thing further on the subject. But its great importance, and the deep solicitude we feel to dispel the thick mists with which prejudice and fraud have overspread it, induce us to place it in a new form, and bring it more home to the mind of the reader. The reasons for adopting this measure will probably so far satisfy the reader, as to preclude the necessity of an apology.

## QUERIES.

Is there a man in the world who can seriously believe :—

I. That a *Catholic* COLONEL, engaged in a plot to murder the *Protestants*, would send fifty miles for a *Protestant*, SERVANT to a *Protestant* gentleman, an inveterate enemy to the Roman Catholics, as an accomplice ?

II. That a journey of a hundred and ten or a hundred and twenty miles could be performed in three days and a half, *the sun rising at seven, and setting at five*, at a season of the year when the rains, then usually prevalent, must have rendered the roads almost impassable ; and by a man who knew nothing of the business which led to the summons he had received, and who, of course, had no temptation to make any extraordinary exertion ?

III. That a stranger, arriving in the suburbs of a city *an hour after sun-set*, and fatigued with a long journey, should, *without any aid from the moon*, immediately find out the lodgings of another stranger, who had arrived the same afternoon?

IV. That Sir William Parsons, who had, at nine in the evening, received intelligence of a plot, to explode at ten the next morning, and the names of some of the principal conspirators, should be so misguided, as to send back the drunken informer, "to get out of Mac-Mahon as much certainty of the plot as he could," instead of immediately apprehending the conspirators?

V. That when the informer returned to the lords justices, he would be allowed to go to bed, before taking his examination?

VI. That when he had slept himself sober, and made circumstantial deposition of such alarming particulars, the privy council would have been such idiots as to take no other precaution than merely "to have a watch set privately upon the lodgings of Mac-Mahon, and also upon lord Macguire," as if they had been plotting to rob orchards or hen-roosts, to bar out a school-master, break lamps in a midnight frolic, or attack the watchmen, instead of plotting to seize the castle, subvert the government, and cut the throats of one or two hundred thousand people?

VII. That a privy or even a common council of the wise men of Gotham would not, under such

circumstances, have instantly apprehended the conspirators, instead of "sitting all night in council," upon one of the simplest points ever discussed, and which could have been decided in five minutes, as well as in five hours, five weeks, or five years; on which the most prompt and decisive measures were imperiously necessary; and at a moment when, if there were any truth in the statement of O'Conally, the salvation or destruction of the state might depend on a single hour?

VIII. That having taken the precaution, on Friday night, of "setting a watch privately upon the lodgings of lord Macguire," thereby establishing their belief that he was an accomplice in the plot, they would not have arrested him at the same time they arrested Mac-Mahon, but waited till conference with the latter and others, and calling to mind Sir William Cole's letter, which led them to "gather that the lord Macguire was to be an actor in surprizing the castle of Dublin?"

IX. That a conspiracy, which was to explode throughout the whole kingdom on the 23d of October, should be arrested in Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, by the detection of it, in Dublin, a few hours before the appointed time?

X. That if it had been intended to murder all the Protestants *throughout the kingdom*, who would not join the conspirators, there would have been no intelligence of a single murder on the 25th, or that, on the 29th, the lords justices

should explicitly declare, that the insurrection was "confined to the mere old Irish in the province of Ulster, and others who had joined them?"

XI. That though the lords justices had recourse to the execrable expedient of putting Mac-Mahon and others to the rack, they should not have extorted a word from any of them, to support the charge of murderous intentions, if any conspiracy had existed, for "cutting off all the Protestants and English throughout the kingdom?"

XII. That if there were a general conspiracy, and of course a large assemblage of people in Dublin, for the purpose of seizing the castle on the 23d, the lords justices would not have been able, on the morning of that day, to apprehend more than two of the leaders and a few common servants?

XIII. And finally, whether, the deposition of O'Conally being incontrovertibly established as false, and he of course perjured, in the two vital points,—

I. The universality of the plot, and

II. The determination to massacre all who would not join in it,

There can be any credit whatever attached to the remainder of his testimony? And whether it does not necessarily follow, that the whole was a manifest fraud and imposture, designed to provoke insurrection, and lead to its usual and inevitable result,—confiscation?

Before the reader decides on answers to these queries, it is hoped he will bear in mind the strong facts adduced in Chapter XIV. to prove that the seventeenth century was, in the fullest sense of the word, the age of perjury, forgery, and fabricated plots. He will there see, that in London, at that period, the boasted courts of justice were, as we have said, mere slaughter-houses, where the depositions of men, stained and covered over with crimes of the most atrocious nature, as the leopard is covered with spots, were received, in cases where the lives of innocent men were at stake, and were finally immolated. He will likewise behold the horrible fact, that the testimony of a man *whose perjury was detected in open court, and there confessed by himself*, was afterwards received, and was the means of consigning innocent persons to the ignominious death of the gallows.

Let him also bear in mind, that forged plots, supported by perjury, and occasionally by the stupid and clumsy contrivance of *letter-dropping*,* had been one of the steady and uniform machines of the government of Ireland, from the invasion to that period; and had produced the forfeiture of millions of acres.

And further, let it not be forgotten, that all the writers, Clarendon, Carte, Warner, Leland, Gordon, &c. agree, that the grand object of the lords justices was, in the beginning, to extend the

* Supra, 168.

flames of civil war; and, when the insurrection had by these means become general, to prevent a cessation of hostilities, for the purpose of producing extensive confiscations. This point being of primary importance, we shall devote a short chapter to it, immediately succeeding the present one.

With all these strong facts taken into view, we then invite a decision; and entertain no doubt of a favourable verdict.

On this subject we stand committed, in the face of all the enlightened men in Christendom; and have no hesitation in pledging ourselves, that if any independent and upright judge or lawyer of any court in France, Germany, England, Scotland, Ireland, or the United States, will pronounce affirmative answers to the above queries, so as to imply a belief in the reality of the conspiracy, as deposed to by the "Protestant gentleman," alias "*servant*," we will cheerfully consent to have this book burned by the hands of the common hangman, and will suppress it ourselves.

## CHAPTER XVI.

*The lords justices alarmed at the prospect of peace. Corroboration of their guilt. Successful in their endeavours to prolong and extend the horrors of war. Execrable policy of the English Parliament.*

THE tenor of the narrative of the origin of the insurrection in 1641, as detailed in the preceding chapter, bears such strong internal evidence of fraud and imposture, as can hardly fail to convince every man of candour, that it was a concerted and nefarious plan, for the purpose of goading the Irish into insurrection, and continuing the system of spoliation, of which the history of Ireland presents to the harrowed feelings of the reader one unbroken series.

This evidence derives important corroboration from the subsequent conduct of the rulers of the country, which of itself would be sufficient to convict them, even had the story been so well concocted as to wear a plausible aspect. This conduct we now expose to the consideration and abhorrence of the reader.

As a preliminary, we presume it will hardly be denied, that those who are opposed to a restoration of peace; who use every effort to extend the horrors of war; who expect to profit by that extension; and who devour the anticipated profits, may, without any unreasonable jealousy, be suspected, unless there be strong reasons to the contrary, of having been instrumental in the commencement of war. But where, in addition to these circumstances, there appear, as in this instance, in their own narrative, manifest fraud and deception, then we have that strong degree of presumptive evidence of which alone the nature of the case admits.

We undertake, therefore, to prove, by testimony the most irrefragable:—

I. That the lords justices left nothing undone to extend the flames of civil war, and to involve in the confiscation attendant on it all the estated men in the kingdom;*

* "It is certain that the lords justices, not only by their words and actions, expressed their unwillingness to stop the growth of the rebellion (as appeareth undeniably in their refusing the offers which both the earl of Ormond and the Parliament of Ireland made to suppress it) but *showed also a desire to increase the distempers of the nation, and were often heard to wish, that the number were greater of such as became criminal.*"[377]

"The marquis of Ormond detested the violent and destructive counsels and measures of the lords justices, *which had spread the rebellion; were ruinous to his majesty's affairs; and likely to effect the utter desolation of his country.*"[378]

[377] Carte, I. 259. [378] Idem, 338.

II. That they, and their friends in England, took infinite pains to defeat every attempt for the restoration of peace, or even a cessation of hostilities, on any terms whatever; and were, therefore, with the rage of demons, determined on a war of extermination; and

"An Irish parliament sat for three days in Dublin. By expelling the members actually in rebellion, and by excluding those who refused to take the oath of supremacy, they were reduced to an inconsiderable number. Yet they breathed the utmost fury against the Romish party; declared for *a rigorous execution* of the penal statutes; and urged, both to the king and English Parliament, the necessity of new and severe laws against recusants. The English parliament echoed these sentiments. The bills were prepared for transmission, and the utmost vengeance denounced against Popery; as *if their sole purpose were to exasperate the insurgents to the utmost*, or as if they had been already completely reduced."[379]

"*To involve as many as possible in the guilt of rebellion was part of the plan adopted by the party of the lords justices*, whose great object was an *extensive forfeiture of lands*. Their agents were indefatigable in the procuring of indictments, not only against open rebels, but also those whose conduct was at all capable of being brought into question. Against the gentry of the Pale was principally directed the rage of their prosecution."[380]

"It is too evident, that as the supine carelessness of some did encourage the Irish to rebel, so there were others in power, who were so taken up with the contemplation of forfeitures, that *they rather increased the fuel*, than took care to suppress the flame."[381]

[379] Leland, III. 197. [380] Gordon, I. 403.
[381] Nalson, II. 629.

III. That they devoured in idea the estates of those whom they goaded into insurrection.*

The evidence produced in the second chapter, page 58 to 62, might be deemed sufficient for the purpose. It is copious, conclusive, and irresistible. But more than ordinary pains, and a greater host of testimony than usual, are necessary for a writer who enters the lists against inveterate opinions, long regarded as incontrovertible, and cherished under the invigorating and congenial

* "The lords justices, in a private letter of their own to the speaker, exclusive of the rest of the council, besought the Commons to assist them with *a grant of some competent proportion of the rebels' lands!* Here the reader will find the key that unlocks *the whole secret of their iniquitous practices;* and here he will find *the motives to the orders they gave for receiving no submissions*; for issuing no proclamations of pardon at first, as the Parliament had suggested; and in short *for all their backwardness in putting an end to the rebellion*, of which several opportunities offered; and consequently for their sacrificing the peace and happiness of their country, and the lives of thousands of their fellow subjects."[382]

"*Extensive forfeitures were the favourite object of the chief governors and their friends.* The Commons of England had very early petitioned that the king would not alienate any of the escheated lands, that might accrue to the crown from the rebellion in Ireland: and they had lately proceeded in a scheme for raising money from the lands thus expected to escheate. A bill was framed for repaying those who should advance certain sums, for suppressing of the rebels, (as was pretended,) by vesting them with proportional estates in Ireland, on terms highly advantageous to a new English plantation. *It evidently tended to exasperate the malcontents*, *and to make all accommodation desperate:* but it was not on this account less acceptable to the popular leaders."[383]

[382] Warner, 199. [383] Leland, III. 186, 187.

influence of bigotry, selfishness, and strong prejudice. We therefore proceed to produce facts, to establish these important positions.

A proclamation, of an ambiguous character, was published in January, 1642, which appeared to promise pardon to such of the insurgents as laid down their arms, and submitted themselves to the government. Numbers of the lords of the Pale, who had been reluctantly goaded into the war by the brutal ferocity of Sir Charles Coote, acting under the desolating orders of the lords justices, gladly availed themselves of this invitation; laid down their arms; surrendered to the duke of Ormond; claimed his protection; and flattered themselves with the fond, but alas! delusive hope of being restored to peace and safety. Had they been received with the indulgence and forgiveness the proclamation appeared to offer, their example would have been generally, if not universally, followed, and the horrors of war brought to an early close; or if any number rejected the proffered mercy, they could have been readily crushed.

The lords justices were as dreadfully alarmed as a fell tiger, whose prey has nearly escaped his ravenous jaws. All their hopes of plunder were likely to be defeated, and their golden harvest of confiscation to be snatched out of their hands, at the moment when they regarded it secure beyond the power of fate. They adopted a most daring and profligate measure, which relieved

them from a result that would have defeated all their schemes, but which blasts their character for ever, and exposes them to infamy and abhorrence. They ordered Ormond to admit of no more submissions; to receive those that offered to surrender themselves, *merely as prisoners of war;** and, in order to avoid the danger of

* "They who had not engaged in actual hostilities, they who were only accused of harbouring, or paying contributions to the rebels, crowded to the earl of Ormond, and *claimed the advantage of the royal proclamation.* The lords justices, who not only favoured the designs of their friends in England, but *expected to have their own services rewarded by a large portion of forfeitures*, *resolved to discourage these pacific dispositions.* Ormond was directed to make no distinction between noblemen and other rebels; *to receive those who should surrender only as prisoners of war;* and to contrive that they should be seized by the soldiers, without admitting them to his presence. They who were sent, in custody, to Dublin, *though men of respectable characters*, *and families engaged in no action with the rebels*, *some*, *sufferers by their rapine*, *averse to their proceedings*, *known protectors of the English*, were all indiscriminately denied access to the justices; closely imprisoned; and threatened with the utmost severity of the law."[384]

"A cessation was recommended by Clanricarde, as a means of giving them some leisure to reflect on their precipitate conduct; to recall them to their allegiance; and *to prevent the desolation of the kingdom:* but the chief governors were actuated by different motives. *They severely condemned the protection granted to Galway:* their orders were express and peremptory, that the earl should RECEIVE NO MORE SUBMISSIONS: every commander of every garrison was ordered not to presume to hold any correspondence with the Irish, or Papists; to give no protections; but *to prosecute all rebels and their harbourers with fire and sword.*"[385]

[384] Leland, III. 188. [385] Idem, 198.

being forced to pardon any of the repentant insurgents, who might induce the duke to pledge his honour for their safety, they directed him to contrive, as far as practicable, that they should be seized by the soldiers, and thus debarred of access to his person. These orders were given to all their other officers, and produced the horrible effects the wretched miscreants intended, to prolong and extend the horrors of war, and multiply confiscations to their utmost wish.

They had subsequently instructions from the Parliament of England to issue a proclamation, offering a pardon, on certain conditions, to such as would submit to their authority, and abandon the cause of the insurgents. With these instructions, *they did not comply;* and assigned the futile reason, that their former proclamation had been unavailing, although they had themselves, by their sinister policy, rendered it nugatory.*

* "In another instance, the conduct of these wretched governors was still more suspicious. The parliament of England had recommended the offer of a general pardon to such rebels as should submit within a certain time, to be limited by the lords justices. *No proclamation was published, no pardon offered, in consequence of these instructions.* To palliate this omission, they pleaded the inefficacy of their former proclamations: the first of which only called on the king's subjects to abandon the rebels, without any positive assurance of mercy: the other offered a pardon, not to the rebels of Ulster, where the insurrection chiefly raged, but to those of Longford and Louth, Meath, and Westmeath. In the two last counties no body of rebels had appeared. And if any outrages or insurrections were to be suppressed, *the lords justices contrived*

A cessation of hostilities had been an object ardently desired by the king, and by the leaders of the Irish insurgents: by the former, in the hope of deriving aid from his forces in Ireland, towards subduing the armies of the Parliament; and by the latter, to be restored once more to the blessings of peace. The bigotry of Charles, and the sinister policy of Ormond, procrastinated this desirable event, and aided the views of the lords justices and their party, who had thrown every possible difficulty in the way of an accommodation. It was, nevertheless, at length concluded, in despite of all the obstacles that folly and wickedness had devised. It is at this time hardly credible, but it is sacredly true, that this act, at which all good men must have rejoiced; which did not compromit an iota of the honour, interest,

*to defeat the effect of their pardon, by exceptions and conditions.* All freeholders of these four counties; all who had shed blood in any action; all who were in prison for spoil or robbery, were expressly excluded from mercy. To others, it was tendered *on condition of their submitting within ten days after the proclamation, and restoring all the property they had seized*, which had quickly been dispersed through various hands. *Such a proclamation was evidently absurd and insidious.* A pardon offered in the name of the English parliament, must have had greater influence than any act of an Irish ministry, despised and suspected by the body of the nation. But the chief governours and their creatures were confident of support, and *experienced in the art of converting forfeitures to their own advantage.*"[386]

[386] Leland, III. 160.

or advantage of the ruling powers in either England or Ireland; and which took place at a time when the Irish had manifestly the advantage over their enemies, in point of military force and resources, excited as much uproar, horror, and indignation, in both islands, as if it had totally overthrown the existing order of things, extirpated the Protestant religion, and given a complete ascendency to the Roman Catholics.* It affords a most important addition to the various proofs we have

* "The heads of that faction, who, by their measures, directions, and creatures, had used as much skill and industry to *improve and continue the rebellion*, as ever the first conspirators did to begin it, *were enraged to see a stop put to the further effusion of blood, and a foundation laid for a pacification*, which would defeat their schemes of extirpation.

"*They protested against all peace with the rebels, without regard to the terms of any;* which must have entailed a perpetual war on the kingdom of Ireland, till the nation itself was in a manner extirpated."[387]

"In the northern province, the Scottish general, Monroe, disclaimed the cessation. And though, when he had first slaughtered some unoffending Irish peasants, he consented to wait the orders of the state of Scotland, or Parliament of England, before he should proceed to further acts of hostility, yet he soon received instructions to carry on the war, without regard to the king's chief governor."[388]

"The rebellion had been suppressed without any of their assistance, were it not for their violent measures and threats of extirpation, which terrifying and making the nobility and gentry of English race desperate, *hurried them in spite of their animosity against the Old Irish, into an insurrection.* For the like detestable purposes, they had starved the war all the time

[387] Carte, I. 453. [388] Leland, III. 250.

already given,* of the insatiable and ravenous thirst of the blood and estates of the Irish, by which the rulers of the two countries were at that time devoured.† The English Parliament passed strong and decisive resolutions,‡ and entered a most solemn protestation, against the cessation, distinguished by the strongest marks of the sanguinary, fanatical, bigoted, and intolerant spirit of the age, which is so loudly extolled for its liberality and illumination. In this wretched per-

it was carrying on in Ireland, and were *angry that a stop was put to it for a time by the cessation.*"[389]

† "The great body of Covenanters in Ulster despised the whole negotiation; the Parliamentarians of Munster opposed *any peace with the Irish.* These reformers, in the fulness of their zeal, could be contented only with the extirpation of Popery, and the rebellious Irish race."[390]

‡ Sept. 20, 1643. "It was resolved, upon the question, that this house doth hold that *a present cessation of arms with the rebels in Ireland is destructive to the Protestant religion, dishonourable to the English nation, prejudicial to the interests of all the three kingdoms*, and therefore do declare they neither do nor can consent or approve of any treaty of a cessation with the rebels, pretended to be begun by the king's commission."[391]

Dec. 30, 1643. "Ordered, that the adventurers of this house for lands in Ireland, and the body of adventurers in London, do meet at the Grocers' Hall, on Thursday, in the afternoon, at two of the clock, and take into their serious consideration, *by what ways and means the British army in Ulster*, *opposing the cessation*, *may be maintained and encouraged to proceed in prosecution of that war of Ireland against the rebels.*"[392]

389 Carte, I. 463. 390 Leland, III. 331.
391 Journals, III. 248. 392 Idem, 353.

* Supra, 58.

formance, replete with sophistry and declamation, they have the hardihood, we had almost said the blasphemy, to assert, "in the face of high heaven," that "*a cessation of arms*" would, by a suspension of religious persecution, "*provoke the wrath of a jealous God!*"* Well may we exclaim, "Why sleep the thunders of heaven?" when wicked men, perpetrating the worst of crimes, varnish them over with such miserable imposture, to delude and deceive mankind! Never did the mind of man conceive, or pen or tongue express, a more abominable or execrable idea than is here unblushingly advanced: for if there be any thing peculiarly calculated "to provoke the wrath of a jealous God," it must be, not "a cessation" of the progress of slaughter

* "The Lords and Commons have reason to declare against *this plot and design of a cessation of arms!!!* as being treated and carried on without their advice; so also because of the great prejudice which will thereby redound to the Protestant religion, and the encouragement and advancement which it will give to the practice of Popery, when these rebellious Papists shall, by this agreement, continue and set up with more freedom their idolatrous worship, their Popish superstitions, and Romish abominations in all the places of their command, to the dishonouring of God, the grieving of all true Protestant hearts, the violation of the laws of the crown of England, and to the *provoking of the wrath of a jealous God;* as if both kingdoms had not smarted enough already, for this sin of too much conniving at, and tolerating of antichristian idolatry, under pretexts of civil contracts and politick agreements."[393]

[393] Rushworth, V. 353.

and desolation, but the wanton waste and destruction of man, made to his own image and likeness.

> "One to destroy is murder by the law,
> And swords uplifted keep the wretch in awe;
> To murder thousands takes a glorious name,
> War's sacred art,—and strews the road to fame."

Let us add a most singular and disgraceful fact; that, by this cessation, which afforded the only chance of retrieving his affairs, Charles lost some of his most devoted followers, whose rancorous and murderous spirit of hostility towards the Irish Roman Catholics, outweighed even their ardent attachment to their monarch, and their idolatrous veneration for the old regime.*

This conduct merits serious consideration. A devouring civil war rages through a country, and renders it a fit abode for devils incarnate; mercenary soldiers spread havoc and desolation around; nothing, sacred or profane, escapes their rage; the altars are sprinkled with the blood of human victims; Humanity turns aside from the hideous and loathsome scenes, and finds it not wonderful that "*it repented the Lord that he had made man upon the earth.*" How infuriate then must be the

* "Several of the king's adherents ascribed *the cessation* to the counsels of the queen and her favourites. Some regarded it as a contradiction to those solemn protestations, which Charles had frequently made against Popery; and declared, that *after this fatal discovery of his real sentiments, they could no longer continue to support his cause!!!*"[394]

[394] Leland, III. 245.

passions of those who shudder at the delightful idea of sheathing the sword; and who, for the sake of plundering the devoted objects of their vengeance, seek to carry on an interminable war of extermination! for this must have been the obvious and inevitable end of those who opposed a cessation of hostilities. There is probably no crime in the long bead-roll of human wickedness, more atrocious than the prolongation, unnecessarily, of war, and particularly of civil war. And yet of this heinous offence many men were guilty, whose names rank high in English history; but whose ambition, avarice, and rage against the Irish, steeled them against the tender cries of lacerated humanity, which loudly pleaded to stay the progress of the devouring sword, and restore the reign of blessed peace and tranquillity.

> "Remember him, the villain, righteous heaven,
> In thy great day of vengeance! *Blast the traitor*
> *And his pernicious counsels, who, for wealth,*
> *For pow'r, the pride of greatness, or revenge,*
> *Would keep his native land in civil wars;*
> When murders, rapes, and massacres prevail;
> When churches, palaces, and cities blaze,
> And desolation covers all the land."[395]

A petition of "the divines of the assembly," delivered to Parliament, July 19, 1643, contains the following extraordinary and extravagant declaration, which the petitioners must have known to be utterly destitute of even the shadow of foundation. It is grounded on, and nearly ver-

[395] Rowe.

batim with, the deposition of the fabulist, Dean Maxwell:*

"In this rebellion, so barbarous and bloody, 154,000 *Protestants, men, women, and children, were massacred in that kingdom, between the 23d of October, when the rebellion broke forth, and the 1st of March following*, by the computation of the priests themselves, who were present, and principal actors in these tragedies, and who were directed by some chief rebels of Ireland to make this computation, lest they should be reported to be more bloody than in truth there was cause. All which appears by the examination of arch-deacon Maxwell, who lived a long time a prisoner with Sir Phelim O'Neil's mother, and was there when this computation was brought in."[396]

To give currency to this wretched, absurd, and notorious imposture, the English House of Commons, with an utter disregard of truth and character, ordered it to be read by the ministers of every parish within the kingdom, in their several churches and chapels;† thus making the temples of the Living God the instruments of poisoning the minds of his worshippers, by the propagation of flagrant falsehood.

† July 25, 1643. "It is this day ordered by the House of Commons, that the ministers of every parish within the kingdom shall read this declaration in their several churches and chapels, on the next fast-day after the same shall come to their hands, after the ending of the first sermon, and before the beginning of the next."[397]

* Supra, 55. [336] Rushworth, V. 355. [397] Idem, 356.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### *Was there a massacre of the Protestants in Ireland in 1641?*

"Fortiter calumniare: aliquid adhærebit."

HAVING, as we hope and trust, satisfactorily disposed of the question of the pretended conspiracy, in 1641, for a general massacre of "such of the Protestants as would not join" the murderers, we now proceed to investigate and combat the legendary tales of the immense numbers which, in the miserable romances, honoured with the prostituted titles of histories of the Irish rebellion in 1641, are stated to have been massacred by the Irish: and we feel confident that we shall satisfy the reader, that they are entitled to exactly the same degree of credit as lord Clarendon's millenium, which has figured to so much advantage in our preceding chapters.

In order to proceed correctly in the investigation, our first step will be, to ascertain the exact state of the allegations which we mean to disprove. We will therefore let the parties narrate their own tales. If they should fail to impose on the reader of the present day, they have no

merit in the failure: as they spared no pains to delude and deceive the world, and hitherto, unfortunately, have been but too successful:

"It would be almost endless to give a particular account of all the detestable cruelties acted by these incarnate devils upon the innocent English, *of whom they destroyed near* 300,000 *in a few months!!!*"[398]

"*The depopulations in this province of Munster do well near equal those of the whole kingdom!!!*"[399]

"There being, since the rebellion first broke out, unto the time of the cessation made Sept. 15, 1643, which was not full two years after, above 300,000 *British and Protestants cruelly murdered in cold blood*, destroyed some other way, or expelled out of their habitations, according to the strictest conjecture and computation of those who seemed best to understand the numbers of English planted in Ireland, *besides those few which fell in the heat of fight during the war*."[400]

"The day appointed for executing this bloody design was the 23d of October, on which day they were to rise all over the island. The design was *really executed*, as projected: and it is said, *on that and the following days above forty thousand English Protestants were massacred by the Irish!!!*"[401]

"Above 154,000 Protestants were massacred in that kingdom from the 23d October to the 1st March following."[402]

"By some computations, those who perished by all these cruelties are supposed to be 150 or 200,000. By the most moderate, and probably the most reasonable account, they are made to amount to forty thousand! if this extenuation itself be not, as is usual in such cases, *somewhat exaggerated!*"[403]

"The innocent Protestants were upon a sudden disseized of their estates; and the persons of above 200,000 men, women, and children *were murdered*, *many of them with exquisite and unheard of tortures*, *within the space of one month!!!*"[404]

398 Burton, 37. 399 Temple, 103. 400 Idem, 6.
401 Rapin, IX. 340. 402 Idem, 343. 403 Hume, III. 545.
404 May, 81. Frankland, 903. Baker, 532.

"A general insurrection of the Irish spread itself over the whole country, in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were forty or fifty thousand of the English Protestants *murdered, before they suspected themselves to be in any danger*, or could provide for their defence, by drawing together into towns or strong houses."[405]

"Though they were prevented of surprising Dublin, by a mere accident, yet through the country, it has been thought, that *in one week they massacred very near one hundred thousand persons, men, women, and children!!!*"[406]

That "Saul slew his thousands, and David his tens of thousands," was, in "olden time," sung by the women of Israel. Every Philistine was magnified into ten; every ten into a hundred; and every hundred into a thousand. But the amplifying powers of the Jewish women fade into insignificance, when compared with those of the Anglo-Hibernian writers. Every Englishman that fell in battle, or otherwise, was murdered. Every man was magnified into a hundred; every ten into a thousand; and every hundred into ten thousand.

Such a spirit of exaggeration has prevailed, in a greater or less degree, in all ages. Even in common occurrences, hardly calculated to excite any interest, we find, every day of our lives, that the statements of current events are so highly coloured, as to differ full as much from the reality, as the countenance of a meretricious courtezan, who has exhausted her stores of carmine and white-lead, differs from the un-

[405] Clarendon's E. II. [406] Warwick, 199.

disguised countenance of an innocent country damsel, who depends wholly on the pure ornaments of beneficent Nature. This being undeniably the case on topics, where no temptation to deception exists, how dreadful must be the falsehood and delusion in cases like the present, where, as we have already stated, and now repeat, ambition, avarice, malice, bigotry, national hatred, and all the other dire passions that assimilate men to demons, are goaded into activity.

The difficulty, stated in the last chapter, of procuring evidence to invalidate O'Conally's legend, was very considerable; but not so formidable, by any means, as we have to encounter in the present one. We are not, however, discouraged: we trust to the force of truth; to the obvious falsehood in these statements; and, above all, to the candour of an enlightened age.

In all other cases, but that of the history of Ireland, to convict a witness of gross, palpable, and notorious falsehood, would be sufficient to invalidate the whole of his evidence: but such has been the wayward fate of that nation, that the most gross and manifest forgeries, which carry their own condemnation with them, are received by the world as though they were

"Confirmations strong as proofs of holy writ."

Or, when some are found too monstrous to be admitted, their falsehood and absurdity do not impair the credulity in the rest of the tales depending on the same authority.

The materials for Irish statistics, at that early period, are rare; a deficiency which involves this subject in considerable difficulty. Had we ample and correct tables of the population of Ireland, our task would be comparatively easy; and we could put down all those tales, with as much ease as we have stamped the seal of flagrant falsehood on so many impostures as we have already investigated.

But we avail ourselves of a sound rule, that we must employ the best evidence that the nature and circumstances of the case will admit; and, fortunately, we have some data, of authority very far from contemptible, on which to reason, in the present instance; which will shed the light of truth on this intricate question, and dispel the dense clouds with which it has been environed by fraud and imposture.

Sir William Petty, the ancestor of the Lansdowne family, laid the foundation of a princely fortune, by the depredations perpetrated on the Irish, after the insurrection of 1641. Of course, he had no temptation to swerve from the truth in their favour: on the contrary, it was his interest, equally with the other possessors of the estates of the plundered Irish, to exaggerate their real crimes, and to lend the countenance of his reputation to their pretended ones. Hence his testimony, on this ground, and as a cotemporary, cannot, so far as it tends to exonerate those upon whose ruin he raised his immense estate,

be excepted against by the enemies of the Irish. We will therefore freely cite him in the case: and the reader will at once perceive to what an extent delusion has been carried, on this subject.

He states the aggregate of the Protestants who perished in eleven years, to have been 112,000;[407] of whom "two-thirds were cut off by war, plague, and famine." It is obvious to the meanest capacity, if, of 112,000, the whole number that fell in that space of time, two-thirds were cut off by war, plague, and famine, that those who fell out of war, in *eleven years*, were only 37,000! We hope to prove, that even this statement, so comparatively moderate, is extravagantly beyond the truth. But, admitting it to be correct, what a wonderful difference between 37,000 in eleven years, and the hundreds of thousands in a few months, that make such an appalling figure in the various "tales of terror," imposture, and perjury, so feelingly narrated by Temple, Borlase, Clarendon, May, Baker, Frankland, Rapin, Leland, and all their coadjutors! Does not the credit of their tales, when thus brought to the test of the talisman of truth, disappear, and,

> "Like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leave not a trace behind?"

Here a remarkable trait, which, as we have stated, characterises Irish history beyond that of any other, displays itself. The writers are not

[407] Petty, 18.

merely at variance with each other, but with themselves: and there is as much discrepancy between different portions of each history, as between that history and truth. We have seen Carte, Leland, Clarendon, and Warner, convict Carte, Leland, Clarendon, and Warner, of most egregious errors, to use no harsher term; and the reader must have perceived, that our sole reliance, for refutation of their mis-statements, has been almost altogether on themselves.

In like manner, we shall satisfactorily prove, that Sir William Petty confutes himself, beyond the power of redemption.

"Mark how a plain tale shall put him down."

He bequeathed to posterity some statistical tables, which throw considerable light on this subject. They are very meagre, it is true; but, meagre as they are, we believe there are no others; at all events, we know of none: and must therefore avail ourselves of them.

He informs us, that the population of Ireland, in 1641, was 1,466,000;* and that the relative proportion of the Protestants to the Catholics, was as two to eleven:† of course, it follows,

* "This shows there were, in 1641, 1,466,000 people."[408]

† "The proportion was as 2 to 11."[409]

We for the present admit this proportion; as, however exaggerated the number of the Protestants may be, it does not affect the point at issue. But, from various circumstances, we doubt whether there was one Protestant to eleven Roman Catholics.

[408] Petty, 18. [409] Ibid.

that the population was thus divided:—about 1,241,000 Roman Catholics, and 225,000 Protestants.

From this conclusion there is no appeal. The whole number of Protestants in the island could not have exceeded 225,000. The supplies of people from England and Scotland, until after the final defeat, capture, condemnation, and death of Charles I. were inconsiderable: and surely there does not exist a single man that çan believe, that out of 225,000, there could have been 112,000 destroyed, and the residue been able to baffle and defeat the insurgents, who comprised the great mass of the nation. It will therefore, we trust, be allowed, as an irresistible conclusion, that Sir William Petty's calculation, although so far more moderate than any of the "tales of terror" we have quoted at the commencement of this chapter, is most extravagantly over-rated, probably trebled or quadrupled; and must, of absolute necessity, be false.

This being the case with the lowest of the calculations, what astonishment must be excited by Burton's 300,000, in a few months; Temple's 300,000, in less than two years; May's 200,000, in one month; Warwick's 100,000, in one week; or Rapin's 40,000, in a few days! Surely there is not, in the history of the world, any parallel case of such gross, palpable, shocking, and abominable deception. Can language be found stròng or bold enough to mark the dishonour of those

who knowingly propagated such falsehood, or the folly or neglect of those who adopted and gave it currency? Their names ought to be held up, as "a hissing and reproach," to deter others from following in their foul and loathsome track of calumny and deception.

On Milton's 626,000 we have already slightly touched.* We shall therefore now pass him over, and notice some of the other writers.

We have fully established, that in three of the provinces, there was not only no massacre, but no insurrection, for five or six weeks: of course, during that period, warfare of every description was confined to Ulster, where the Protestants were by no means so numerous as elsewhere. But, admitting that they were equally divided in the four provinces, then the number in Ulster was not quite 60,000;† and they possessed several walled towns, had considerable forces, and not merely defended themselves against the attacks of the insurgents, but frequently vanquished them. It is therefore certain that the numbers that fell, in any way, must have been very inconsiderable, compared with the bloated and

† Carte, as will appear at the close of this chapter, estimates the Protestants in Ulster at about double 60,000, although he rates the whole number in Ireland at only 220,000. His assumption is obviously incorrect; but, as it cannot possibly affect any of our conclusions, we deem it unnecessary to go into an examination of its errors.

* Supra, 20.

extravagant statements whereby the world has been deceived on this subject.

Yet Thomas May, secretary to the Long Parliament, who published a history of that Parliament, about six years after the commencement of the insurrection, had the inexpressible wickedness or folly, or both, to state, as we have seen, that there were "200,000 men, women, and children murdered, *within the space of one month*."*

It cannot be necessary to go into detail, to refute this statement. A single glance at the preceding facts, the aggregate of the Protestant population of the country, and the limited range of warfare during the entire "month" that May takes into view, will satisfy the reader how utterly regardless this writer was of even the slightest semblance of truth.

It is remarkable that Baker and Frankland, in their annals, copy the statement of May, without the variation of a word.

We shall furnish another case, more barefaced and profligate, if possible, than May's. When the cessation was agreed upon, there was, as already stated, a most furious outcry raised on the subject, throughout the three kingdoms; and the army in Munster, in a remonstrance against it, hazarded the daring falsehood, that the "depopulations" of Munster nearly "equalled those of all the rest of the kingdom;"† although it was even then pre-

* May, ubi supra.

† Temple, 103.

tended, that there had been 154,000 massacred in Ulster; to which let the reader add what this army might choose to set down for Leinster and Connaught, which would probably be at least 25,000 for each; thus allowing above 200,000 for the rest of the kingdom, and the same number for Munster!!! or 400,000 for the whole, out of 225,000!!!!

One more case shall close this odious detail. We have seen, even by the account of the lords justices themselves, that, on the 29th of October, *six days* after the commencement of the insurrection, it was confined to "the mere old Irish in the province of Ulster, and others who adhered to them."* We have likewise seen, from Temple, Leland, and Warner, that at the commencement, the insurgents so far adhered to "*the original scheme of the conspiracy*," that, "at first, *few fell by the sword,*† *except in open war and assault*:" and yet Sir Philip Warwick gives us to understand, that *in one week there were* 100,000 *massacred*, than which, we may venture to assert, a more consummate and atrocious falsehood never was ushered into the world, for the purposes of deception. Sir Philip is wholly inexcusable; as his work was not published during the convulsions of that period, when there might have been some difficulty in divesting himself of the influence of the raging passions which then convulsed the political elements. It did not appear until

* Supra, 334.

† Leland, ubi supra.

after the restoration, of which it narrates the occurrences.

With what ineffable disgust and abhorrence, then, must every ingenuous mind revolt at such loathsome frauds and impositions!

On the subject of the pretended massacre, some of the observations of Carte are judicious and unanswerable; and would be sufficient, independent of the other evidence we have produced, to put down forever those miserable legends about so many hundreds of thousands of the Protestants cut off in a few weeks, or months, or years, and to stamp on the foreheads of their authors the broad seal of imposture. He states, that the extravagant numbers, asserted to be massacred, were "*more than there were of English, at that time, in all Ireland.*"[410]

"Sir William Petty," he adds, "computes the British, *including therein both English and Scotch*, to be, before the rebellion, as 2 to 11 of the Irish; *at which rate, there were about* 220,000 British in the whole kingdom! Now it is certain, that the great body of the English was settled in Munster and Leinster, *where very few murders were committed;* and that in Ulster, which was *the dismal scene of the massacre*, there were above 100,000 Scots, who, before the general plantation of it, had settled in great numbers in the counties of Down and Antrim: and new shoals of them had come over, upon the plantation of the six escheated counties: and they were so very powerful therein, that the Irish, either out of fear of their numbers, or some other politic reason, spared those of that nation, *making proclamation, on pain of death, that no Scotsman should be molested in body, goods, or lands*, whilst they raged with so much fury against the English."[411]

[410] Carte, I. 177. [411] Ibid.

To these facts, he adds the following reflections:

"It cannot therefore reasonably be presumed, that there were at most more than 20,000 English souls, of all ages and sexes, in Ulster at that time: and of these, as appears by the lords justices' letter, there were *several thousands got safe to Dublin; besides* 6,000 *women and children*, which captain Mervyn saved in Fermanagh; and others that got safe to Derry, Colerain, and Carrickfergus, and went from these and other parts into England."[412]

It is obvious, that it is impossible to reconcile the latter part of this quotation with the rest; a case, as we have repeatedly stated, that incessantly occurs in Irish histories. The author informs us, on rational grounds, that there were "*not more than* 20,000 *English in Ulster;*" that "*several thousands got safe to Dublin;*" that "6,000 *women and children were saved* in Fermanagh;" and that "others *got safe* to Derry, Colerain, and Carrickfergus." These all-important and conclusive facts he connects with a statement of "the *extreme cruelty* with which the insurgents raged against the English," and with a notice of a "*dismal scene of the massacre*," the subjects of which massacre are not very easily found, and, at all events, could not have been very numerous: for, let us add together "several thousands," and "6,000," and the "others" who "got safe" into the specified towns, where there were numerous garrisons; where, of course, in a time of violence and commotion, the

[412] Carte, I. 177.

inhabitants of the circumjacent country would naturally seek refuge; and where, it is not extravagant to suppose, that "the others," who thus "got safe," might have amounted to some thousands: let us then deduct the aggregate from 20,000, the total number of English, and we shall find a slender remainder. But the plain fact is, that the writers on this subject are so haunted by the idea of a massacre, that although it rests on the sandy foundation of forgery and perjury, as shall be fully proved in the sequel, and although many of their own statements, in the most unequivocal manner, give it the lie direct, their minds cannot be divested of the terrific object. These passages from Carte furnish a strong case in point. The most ardent friend of Ireland could not desire a much more complete proof of the fallacy of the accounts of the pretended massacre, than is here given by this author himself, who, nevertheless, wonderful to tell! appears to resist the evidence of his own facts, and to be blind to the obvious inference to which they inevitably lead.

We have already borne strong testimony to the general correctness of the intentions of Ferdinando Warner, a clergyman of the church of England, as displayed throughout his "History of the Rebellion and Civil War of Ireland," with the remarkable exception of the state of that country, previous to 1641, in which he has fallen into the most egregious errors. He appears to have been the only writer who has gone into any

elaborate investigation of the legendary tales of the pretended massacre; and his views of the subject well deserve the most serious attention of the reader. After stating the uncertainty of the accounts, and the consequent difficulty of making an exact estimate, he pronounces a strong and unequivocal sentence of condemnation on the Munchausen tales we are combating; and avers, that

"*It is easy enough to demonstrate the falsehood of the relation of every Protestant historian of this rebellion.*"[413]

He proceeds to render a satisfactory account of the grounds on which this statement rests:

"*To any one who considers how thinly Ireland was at that time peopled by Protestants, and the province of Ulster particularly, where was the chief scene of the massacre,* THOSE RELATIONS UPON THE FACE OF THEM APPEAR INCREDIBLE."[414]

He then enters into an elaborate detail, in confirmation of this opinion, which the reader will find in Chapter I. page 20, and which reduces the number "*murdered*" to 4,028; and, let it not be forgotten, nearly one-half of even this number rests wholly on "*report!!*"

He adds, it is true, nearly double that number, who fell victims to ill-usage: thus making an aggregate of about 12,000. But even in this number he himself does not believe: for he closes with a strong and decisive condemnation of the state-

[413] Warner, 296. [414] Ibid.

ment, in the following remarkable view of the subject:

"If we should allow that the cruelties of the Irish, out of war, extended to these numbers, which, CONSIDERING THE NATURE OF SEVERAL OF THE DEPOSITIONS, *I think in my conscience we cannot*, yet, to be impartial, we must allow that there is no pretence for laying a greater number to their charge."[415]

Thus we close this subject with stating, that these hundreds of thousands are reduced by Carte to 20,000, less "several thousands," and "6,000 women and children," and "others;" and by Warner to about 12,000, a large portion of which, "in his conscience," he cannot allow! Would it not be an insult to the reader, to offer another word, to prove the utter falsehood of all the terrific statements given of the subject, whereby the world has been so long and so grossly deceived?

[415] Warner, 296.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

*View of the spirit of the hostile parties in Ireland. Murderous and never-enough-to-be-execrated orders of the lords justices, and of the Long Parliament. Illustrious contrast on the part of the Irish.*

BEFORE we enter on the investigation of the horrible and unparalleled cruelties alleged to have been perpetrated by the Irish in this civil war, we regard it as a duty to present a view of the spirit manifested in the orders given to the commanding generals on both sides, which will shed important light on this interesting subject; and add still further corroboration to the various proofs we have already adduced, of the unprecedented deceptions practised upon, and the erroneous impressions entertained by, the world at large, respecting Irish affairs.

He must be a mere sciolist in history, who requires to be informed, that the most rigorous military discipline has too frequently, in every age, been utterly inadequate fully to restrain the ferocious and sanguinary spirit of mercenary armies, which, accustomed to scenes of blood and desolation, are too prone to be steeled

against the calls of humanity. It is well known, moreover, that civil wars are almost always signalized by incomparably more ruthless barbarity than wars between hostile nations. But, if the wisest regulations, to restrain military violence, be always found difficult, and too often impossible, to be carried into effect, even in well-regulated armies, how frightful must be the result, when murder and desolation are not merely tolerated, but absolutely commanded; when the rulers

> "Cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war;"

when military outrage is excited, by orders to slaughter the unoffending; and when the incapacity to resist the violence of one party, is made a pretext for murder by the other!

It will astonish the reader to learn, that the tenants of the regions below do not differ more from the purest cherub or seraph that the mind of man can conceive, than the fiend-like spirit of the orders promulgated by the lords justices, from those issued by the leaders of the Irish. None of those destroyers of mankind, who

> "Wade thro' seas of blood,
> And walk o'er mountains of slaughtered bodies;"[416]

who riot in human misery; could exceed the lords justices, in the desolating inhumanity of their orders, which breathed nothing but an infuriate spirit of havoc and devastation.

[416] Lee.

Their commanders were directed to "*consume, destroy, and demolish all the places where the rebels were relieved or harboured;*" to "kill, slay, and destroy all the rebels and *their relievers.*"[417] But this was not all, nor half. How can we proceed to relate the execrable tale? It will hardly be believed. For the honour of human nature, it were to be wished that it could be utterly blotted from the records of history: but this is impossible. There it remains, and there it will eternally remain, to the never-dying infamy of those miscreant rulers. The orders close with a direction "*to kill and destroy all the men able to bear arms,*" in the places where the rebels were "*relieved and harboured!!!!*"*

* "*Order of the Lords Justices and Council to the earl of Ormond.*

"By the lords justices and council,

Wm. Parsons,
Jo. Borlace.

"The rebels having assembled themselves in arms in hostile manner, with banners displayed, in several places about this city of Dublin, intending and openly professing to starve this city and this state, and his majesty's forces here, that so the rebels may the more easily possess themselves of the kingdom, deprive his majesty of his royal crown and sovereignty here, and root out, murder, and destroy, all the British and Protestants in the kingdom,

"It is resolved, That it is fit that his lordship do endeavour with his majesty's forces *to wound, kill, slay, and destroy*, by all the ways and means he may, all the said rebels, and their adherents and *relievers;* and *burn, spoil, waste, consume, de-*

[417] Carte, III. 61.

The murderous spirit of these orders for the destruction of the harbourers of the insurgents, must excite the most unqualified horror and indignation in every man not utterly destitute of the feelings of humanity. It may be readily conceived, that defenceless individuals, scattered over an extensive country, cannot possibly prohibit armed bodies of men from access to their houses or plantations; nor can the inhabitants of cities, towns, or villages, destitute of fortifications or garrisons, prevent their entrance; the attempt would ensure destruction, and could only be dictated by absolute insanity: and nothing but the most flagrant destitution of justice could ever induce commanders to punish the bare submission to overwhelming force and violence, with the rigour and severity due to the perpetration of the highest species of crimes.

Suppose, for a moment, that a civil war raged in this country, which God forbid: suppose, further, that an army of five thousand men were to

*stroy, and demolish, all the places, towns, and houses, where the said rebels are, or have been, relieved and harboured,* and all the corn and hay there; and *kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting able to bear arms!!!!*

"Given at his majestie's castle of Dublin, 23d February, 1641–2.

| | |
|---|---|
| R. DILLON, | F. WILLOUGHBY, |
| THO. ROTHERAM, | J. TEMPLE, |
| AD. LOFTUS, | ROBERT MEREDITH."[418] |

[418] Carte, III. 61.

possess themselves, by force, of the city of Philadelphia. What sentence would be pronounced on the commanders of the adverse armies, who, to punish submission to violence, which our citizens had not the means of preventing, should, after the expulsion of their enemies, order an indiscriminate slaughter of all those capable of bearing arms? Would they not deserve to expiate their guilt, by the most cruel torments that human ingenuity could devise? Yet this was precisely the spirit of the orders issued by the lords justices, who therefore merit to be ranked with the Neros, the Caligulas, the Domitians, and those other monsters, whose supreme delight was in the immolation of the human species.

This chapter being devoted merely to a review of the spirit with which the orders for war were issued on both sides, we reserve for a subsequent one a detail of the barbarous fidelity with which these horrible orders were carried into effect.

It must sicken every friend of mankind, to learn that the English Parliament was actuated by the same shocking spirit of extermination towards the Irish. It issued an ordinance, agreed upon after due deliberation, that "*no quarter should be given to any Irishman or Papist born in Ireland;*" and that "*they should be excepted out of all capitulations.*"* This horrible decree, worthy

* "*October* 24, 1644.

"An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, commanding that no officer or soldier, either by

of a pandemonium of fallen angels, Lucifer president, and Belzebub secretary, attaches an eternal blot on the escutcheons of the Hambdens, the Pyms, and the Essexes of that body, who, in their rancorous and remorseless hatred of Ireland and

sea or land, shall give any quarter to any Irishman, or to any Papist born in Ireland, which shall be taken in arms against the Parliament of England.

"The Lords and Commons assembled in the Parliament of England do declare, that *no quarter shall be given to any Irishman, nor to any Papist born in Ireland*, which shall be taken in hostility against the Parliament, either upon the sea, or within this kingdom, or dominion of Wales: and therefore do order and ordain, that the lord general, lord admiral, and all other officers and commanders, both by sea and land, *shall except all Irishmen, and all Papists born in Ireland, out of all capitulations, agreements*, and compositions hereafter to be made with the enemy: and shall, upon the taking of *every such Irishman or Papist born in Ireland* as aforesaid, forthwith *put every such person to death.*

"And it is further ordered and ordained, that the lord general, lord admiral, and the committees of the several counties, do give speedy notice hereof, to all subordinate officers and commanders, by sea and land respectively; who are hereby required to use their utmost care and circumspection, that this ordinance be duly executed: and lastly, the Lords and Commons do declare, that every officer and commander by sea or land, that *shall be remiss or negligent in observing the tenour of this ordinance, shall be reputed a favourer of the bloody rebellion of Ireland*, and shall be liable to such condign punishment as the justice of both houses of Parliament shall inflict upon him."[419]

[419] Rushworth, V. 729.*

* The reader is requested to observe that this volume is erroneously paged; page 729 occurring twice.

Irishmen, lost sight of every principle of humanity and justice, and of all the laws of civilized warfare.

The phraseology of this ordinance is very ambiguous, probably through design. It orders to be murdered,—for,

"Disguise it as we will,"

it is sheer, downright murder—it orders, we say, to be murdered, "*all Irishmen and Papists born in Ireland.*" The sweeping command to murder "all Irishmen," rendered it wholly unnecessary to add, "all Papists born in Ireland," unless they wished the world to believe, that a "Papist born in Ireland" was a species of being different from an "Irishman."

To cap the climax of this atrocious cruelty, and to guard against the goadings of

"The tyrant conscience,"

whereby their commanders might be tempted to yield to the dictates of

"Mercy! the brightest diadem of empire!
Mercy, that does distinguish men from brutes,"

they denounced "condign punishment" against all such as should be "remiss or negligent" in carrying the ordinance into execution. They were to be stigmatized with the foulest stain that the vocabulary of reproach could at that day furnish; that is, "to be reputed favourers of the bloody rebellion of Ireland," and to be punished accordingly.

While such a barbarous and murderous decree imprints its inextinguishable and sanguinary stain on the records of that Parliament and party, it requires the most unblushing impudence and effrontery to continue the outrageous abuse of the Irish, for the pretended murders and massacres of 2 or 300,000 men, women, and children, out of a population not exceeding 225,000 in the aggregate!

The reader may perhaps flatter himself with the fond hope that these orders were not, nor intended to be, carried into operation. Let him not

"Lay this flattering unction to his soul."

A few pages hence, he will find that the sanguinary rulers found sanguinary ruffians, to carry their sanguinary mandates into effect, in the true spirit of desolation in which they were conceived.

Far different was the spirit by which the calumniated Irish were actuated. They denounced the strongest sentence of excommunication not merely against murderers, but against thieves, spoilers, robbers, and extorters; as well as against all such as should favour, receive, or any way assist them;* and, lest this denunciation should

* "*Articles agreed upon, ordained and concluded, in the general congregation, held at Kilkenny, May*, 1642.

"We declare [the present] war, openly Catholic, to be lawful and just; *in which war, if some of the Catholics be found to proceed out of some particular and unjust title, covetousness,*

prove ineffectual, they ordered their generals to punish offenders in the premises, under pain of interdiction.

These orders are signed by three archbishops, four bishops, and twenty-one other dignitaries of the church, of various degrees. They were enacted in a grand council, held in Kilkenny, in May, 1642. What a glorious, what an honourable contrast for Ireland, between the spirit they display, and that of the murderous ordinance of the Long Parliament, that *no quarter should be given to any Irishman!* or that of the lords jus-

*cruelty, revenge, or hatred, or any such unlawful, private intentions, we declare them therein grievously to sin, and therefore worthy to be punished and restrained with ecclesiastical censures,* if (advised thereof) they do not amend.

"We will and declare *all those that murder, dismember, or grievously strike; all thieves, unlawful spoilers, robbers of any goods, extorters; together with all such as favour, receive, or any ways assist them, to be excommunicated,* and so to remain until they completely amend and satisfy, no less than if they were namely proclaimed excommunicated:

"We command all and every the generals, colonels, captains, and other officers of our Catholic army, to whom it appertaineth, that they *severely punish all transgressors of our aforesaid command, touching murderers, maimers, strikers, thieves, and robbers;* and if they fail therein, we command the parish priests, curates, or chaplains, respectively, to declare them interdicted; and that they shall be excommunicated, if they cause not *due satisfaction to be made unto the commonwealth, and the party offended.* And this the parish priests or chaplains shall observe, under pain of excommunication of sentence given ipso facto."[420]

[420] Rushworth, V. 519, 520.

tices, *to kill all the males able to bear arms, inhabiting in places where the rebels* (as they were falsely styled) *were harboured!* O, much-abused country! how little is the world acquainted with thy horrible sufferings! how inadequately does it appreciate thy real character! To what wretched historians has thy sad tale been confided! Will the justice of heaven never avenge thy wrongs, nor vindicate thy rights? Must centuries still roll on, and behold the countless blessings, which heaven has lavished, with liberal hand, on one of the fairest portions of the globe, blighted and blasted by a wretched policy, worthy only of ruthless eastern despotism?

## CHAPTER XIX.

### *Examination of the cruelties said to have been perpetrated by the Irish.*

"I could a tale unfold, whose lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul; freeze thy young blood;
Make thy two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres;
Thy knotted and combined locks to part,
Like quills upon the fretful porcupine."——*Shakspeare.*

THE frauds and falsehoods which we have exposed to the reprobation of the reader, respecting the immense number of persons said to have been murdered during the insurrection of 1641, have, we trust, prepared him to lend an impartial ear to the exposure of frauds and falsehoods far more gross and shocking, respecting the pretended cruelties of the insurgents.

In Chapter XVII. we have allowed the accusers to prefer their charges in their own language, without exaggeration or extenuation. It is the only fair course of procedure. We pursue the same plan here; and lay before the reader the revolting statements of May, Temple, Whitelock, Leland, Carte, Hume, and Mrs. Macauley:

"People of all conditions and qualities, of every age and sex, daily presented themselves, spoiled and stripped, with *no coverings but rags or twisted straw to hide their privities:* some wounded almost to death; others *frozen with cold;* some tired with travel, and so surbated that *they came into the city creeping on their knees!!!!*

"They appeared like walking ghosts in every street; and all the barns, stables, and outhouses were filled with them, where they soon died in so great numbers, that *all the churchyards of Dublin could not contain them!!!*"[421]

"Some had their bellies ript up, and so left with their *guts running about their heels*. But this horrid kind of cruelty was principally reserved by these inhuman monsters for women, whose sex they neither pitied nor spared, hanging up several women, many of them great with child, whose bellies they ript up as they hung, and so let the little infants fall out; a course they ordinarily took with such as they found in that sad condition. And *sometimes they gave their children to swine. Some the dogs eat:* and some, taken alive out of their mother's bellies, they cast into ditches. And for sucking children, and others of a riper age, some had their brains knocked out; others were trampled under foot to death. *Some they cut in gobbets and pieces; others they ripped up alive. Some were found in the fields, sucking the breasts of their murdered mothers.* Others lay stifled in vaults and cellars; others starved in caves, crying out to their mothers rather to send them out to be killed by the rebels, than to suffer them to starve there."[422]

"They drowned many hundreds, men, women, and innocent children, in the rivers. *Some they sent to sea in a rotten vessel, without any sails or rudder*, to be cast away: and great numbers of the English, after they had done all drudgeries for the rebels in hopes of mercy, had all their throats cut by them: and with some of them *the execrable villains and monsters would make themselves pastime and sport*, before their death, trying who could hack deepest into the Englishmen's flesh: and so with the highest torture and cruelty mangled them to death."[423]

"Sometimes they enclosed them in some house or castle, which they set on fire, with a brutal indifference to their cries, and *a hellish triumph over their expiring agonies.* Sometimes the captive English were plunged into the first river, to which they had been driven by their tormentors. One hundred and ninety were, at once, precipitated from the bridge of Portnedown. *Irish ecclesiastics were seen encouraging the carnage.*

[421] May, 86. [422] Temple, 89. [423] Whitelock, 49.

*The women forgot the tenderness of their sex, pursued the English with execrations, and imbrued their hands in blood. Even children, in their feeble malice, lifted the dagger against the helpless prisoners!!!*"[424]

"They gave a loose to the mortal hatred they bore the English, *and rivers of blood were inhumanly shed.* The island, formerly renowned for its piety, was now become a scene of massacres, which it would be shocking to humanity to repeat. *Every thing that the ferocity of their minds and the brutality of their nature could suggest, was put in practice by the common soldiers.*"[425]

"An universal massacre commenced of the English, now defenceless, and *passively resigned to their inhuman foes!!!* No age, no sex, no condition was spared. The wife, weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same stroke. The old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent a like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin. In vain did flight save from the first assault. Destruction was every where let loose, and met the hunted victims at every turn."[426]

"*Slaughtering the English was represented by the priests as the most meritorious of religious acts!! They exhorted the people with tears in their eyes to rid the world of these declared enemies to the Catholic faith and piety.* Many of the rebels would say, after bragging of the number of barbarous murders they had committed, that they knew if they should die, their souls would go immediately to heaven."[427]

"Some thousands of English were burned in their houses; others were *stripped naked*, and, *in hundreds in a drove*, pricked forward with swords and spikes to river sides, and from thence pushed headlong into the stream. Some were manacled and thrown into dungeons, and there left to perish at leisure. *Others were mangled, and left to languish in the highways.* Some were happy enough to suffer the milder death of hanging. Other more unfortunate wretches were buried alive. This was the fate of a poor little infant, who, whilst he was putting in the grave, cried out to his dead parent, 'Mammy,

[424] Leland, III. 147.
[425] Carte, I. 177.
[426] Hume, III. 542.
[427] Macauley, III. 71.

save me!' yet could not his innocent cry pierce the heart of the hardened wretch from whom he received his fate. *Some were mangled and hung upon tenter hooks!!* Some with ropes round their necks, were dragged through woods, bogs, and ditches, till they died. *Some were hanged up by the arms, and then cut and slashed,* to see how many wounds an Englishman could endure. Some were ripped up, and their entrails left hanging about their heels. These kinds of cruelties were exercised on children of all ages, and many women with child suffered the same fate. *Children were forced to carry their sick and aged parents to the place of slaughter!!* There were of those barbarians some so ingenious in their cruelty as to tempt their prisoners with the hopes of preserving their lives, to imbrue their hands in the blood of their relations. *Children were in this manner impelled to be the executioners of their parents, wives of their husbands, mothers of their children!!* and then, when they were thus rendered accomplices in guilt, they were deprived of that life they endeavoured to purchase at so horrid a price. *Children were boiled to death in cauldrons. Some wretches were flayed alive. Others were stoned to death. Others had their eyes plucked out; their ears, nose, cheeks, and hands cut off;* and thus rendered spectacles to satiate the malice of their enemies. Some were buried up to the chin, and there left to perish by degrees. *One Protestant minister was put into a cask, lined with iron spikes, and then rolled up and down till he was dead!!! Parents were roasted to death before their children, and children before their parents!!!*"[428]

To establish the falsehood of these hideous portraits of cruelty, a few lines might suffice. Those lines would carry conviction. It would be enough to state the simple fact, that the originals were drawn by the miserable and abandoned falsifiers, who have so long deluded the world with a belief that there were 100,000 persons massacred in one week, 200,000 in a month,

[428] Macauley, III. 71, 72.

and 300,000 in two years; (whereas Sir William Petty, as we have stated, makes *the whole number that fell in eleven years, by war, plague, famine, and massacre*, 112,000, which we have proved extravagantly over-rated; and Warner, who had no partiality for the Roman Catholics, and who took more pains to investigate the subject than any other writer, either of the seventeenth or eighteenth century, reduces the number *killed out of war* to 4,028; with which Carte's account appears to correspond;)—who have recorded, that a general insurrection and massacre took place throughout the kingdom, on the 23d of October, 1641, whereas three-fourths of it were, for entire weeks afterwards, in a state of perfect tranquillity;—who have also recorded the falsehood, that Ireland enjoyed a sort of millenium for forty years previous to the insurrection, whereas she suffered, during that period, every species of the most revolting tyranny; in a word, whom we have, in every page of our work, convicted of a total disregard of truth. All these stories were dictated by the same spirit of imposture; penned by the same writers; rest, of course, on the same authority; and the falsehood of those we have discussed being unanswerably proved, the residue must share the same sentence of condemnation.

This, we trust, would be sufficient. Those convicted of fraud and falsehood, in so many points, where, as we have already stated, detec-

tion trod so closely on their heels, are utterly undeserving of credit, in any case; but more particularly in those wherein the difficulty of detection invites the fraudulent to falsehood and forgery.

But of this plea we scorn to avail ourselves. We shall enter into a full examination of the evidence on which these legends rest; and feel confident that it will excite astonishment, how, even in times of the grossest delusion, they could have ever gained the slightest credence.

Temple, of all the writers whom we have quoted, is the only original author. His book is one unvaried tissue of fables, of which he was himself so much and so justly ashamed, that he endeavoured to suppress it; and actually refused permission to the booksellers of London to print a second edition.* But it was in vain: it too much

* *Extract of a Letter from the Earl of Essex, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, to Mr. Secretary Coventry.*

"Dublin Castle, Jan. 6, 1674–5.

"I am to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 22d of December, wherein you mention a book that was newly published, concerning the cruelties committed in Ireland, at the beginning of the late war. Upon further inquiry, I find Sir J. Temple, master of the rolls here, author of that book, was this last year sent to by several stationers of London, to have his consent to the printing thereof. But *he assures me that he utterly denied it;* and whoever printed it, did it without his knowledge. Thus much I thought fit to add to what I formerly said upon this occasion, *that I might do this gentleman right, in case it was suspected he had any share in publishing this new edition.*"[429]

[429] Essex, 2.

flattered the existing prejudices,—too much favoured the views of those who unjustly possessed the estates of which the Irish were plundered, to hope that it would be allowed to sink into oblivion.

The remaining writers are mere copyists; and not only derive their facts, with occasional amplifications, from Temple, but borrow his very language. We shall notice four of them;—Borlase, Carte, Macauley, and Hume.

Borlase's history was published in 1688; and is a most wretched and despicable compilation. In one point, however, he has shown a considerable degree of art, in avoiding an impolitic step, which Temple took, and which utterly destroyed the credibility of his history. The latter, to give support to his fabulous narrative, annexes the depositions on which it is grounded; and which bear the most indisputable marks of fraud and perjury, as has been proved in Chapter II. and shall be more fully displayed in the present one, whereby it will appear, that nothing but folly and wickedness could have devised, nothing but the grossest delusion have credited them. Borlase has stated the number of pretended murders in gross, but wholly omitted the depositions, and given merely the names of the witnesses, whereby his readers have no means of ascertaining the rottenness of the foundation on which they rest.

Carte's account affords a most striking display of the infatuation that prevails on this topic. The

reader, in page 371, will find that he states, that the English were principally settled in Leinster and Munster; that there were few murders committed in those provinces; that the insurgents spared the Scotch, who composed the great mass of the Protestant population of Ulster; that there were not in that province more than 20,000 English; that of this number, "several thousands" escaped to Dublin; that "6,000 were saved in Fermanagh;" that "others," not improbably thousands, found an asylum in three fortified towns: and yet

*This same historian, in the very same page, and at the distance of a few lines,*

Pathetically and feelingly informs his readers, that

RIVERS OF BLOOD WERE SHED!!

And

MASSACRES PERPETRATED, WHICH IT WOULD BE SHOCKING TO HUMANITY TO REPEAT!!

While we are stating these particulars, we feel mixed sensations of astonishment and indignation, which the reader may conceive, but which language cannot express. We are lost in the mass of reflections excited by this stupendous delirium of the human mind. It affords another instance of the gross and glaring contradictions so constantly found between the different parts of the same history of Irish affairs. It is an extraordinary fatality, from which even the very few whose intentions appear correct have not escaped. We

50

have frequently had occasion to call the reader's attention to it; and are persuaded, there is not elsewhere any parallel to be found. We have met with various cases, in which, after the historian has given a series of strong, bold, decisive facts, calculated to excite admiration of the endowments, sympathy for the sufferings, and eager wishes for the success, of that oppressed, and, we had almost said, heaven-abandoned nation, he is led to draw inferences not merely unwarranted by his facts, but in direct hostility with them. Of this wonderful contradiction between fact and induction, there are probably in Warner fifty, and in Leland a hundred instances: but there is none more remarkable than this of Carte. It would be like a search after the philosopher's stone; the genial climate and verdure of Italy in Iceland; free government in Turkey; or ease and opulence in the wretched cabins of the Irish peasantry; to go in quest of those "*rivers of blood*," or those "*massacres*," so "shocking to humanity," out of the remnant of his 20,000 English, after the "several thousands" whom he rescued from the skein or the stiletto of the Irish assassins.

Mrs. Macauley has outdone the other painters of those imaginary scenes. More than half of her detail appears to be the production of her own invention; as there is nothing in Temple or Rushworth, or any other writer we have seen, to warrant it; particularly the story of the clergy-

man put into the cask with iron spikes, and rolled to death; and the children roasted to death before their parents, and the parents before their children.

Of all the writers on this subject, there is none deserving of more unqualified censure than Hume. He was under the influence of none of the dire passions that actuated some of the others. With a powerful mind and keen penetration, it was his duty to have examined carefully the credibility of his authorities; and it required a very cursory examination, indeed, of Temple's history, to be satisfied that to quote it was an ineffable disgrace. Yet, astonishing to tell, out of thirty-four references, in his account of the pretended massacre of 1641, there are no less than twenty-seven to Temple, only five to Rushworth, and one each to Nalson and Whitelock. How utterly unworthy this procedure was of the talents and reputation of Hume; how indelible a stain it attaches to his memory; and how far, as respects this individual case, he is reduced to a level with the common race of historians, may be readily conceived, from the extracts already given from Temple's history,* and from those which follow in the present chapter. A large portion of the most horrible passages, for which he quotes Temple's history, are grounded, in that wretched romance, on hear-say testimony; which

* Supra, 38, 41, 42.

is distinctly stated in the depositions, as will appear in the course of the present chapter, and which therefore could not have been unknown to Hume, and ought to have forbidden him to place the least dependence on their authority.

But his offence is not confined to the original use of those "tales of terror." No: a much higher and more inexpiable one remains behind.

Dr. John Curry published a work of most transcendent merit, of which the title is, "Historical Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland," in which he fully displayed the falsehood, and completely overthrew the narrative, of Temple. The peculiar characteristic of this work is, that every important fact it contains is supported by the most indisputable authority, not merely in the form of reference, but by exact quotation. It may be safely asserted, that a more valuable historical work was never published.* The author, in 1764, sent a copy of it to David Hume, then at Paris, with a request that he would give it a candid consideration, and correct the errors that he had committed, by his dependence on such a deceptious guide as Temple. To this letter he

* This review is earnestly recommended to the attention of the learned world. It is a perfect model of the manner in which history, on all disputed points, ought to be written. So luminous is Curry's style, so cogent his reasoning, and so indisputable his authorities, that the most inveterate prejudices must give way, on a candid perusal of the work.

sent an "*evasive answer*,"* in which he declined committing himself by any promise; and never, in any subsequent edition, corrected a single error in this part of his work. On this conduct, there can, among upright men, be but one sentence pronounced; and that is, a most unqualified sentence of reprobation.

To travel through the loathsome details of the evidence by which the terrific descriptions of the massacre (as it is pompously styled) are supported, is as disgusting to the moral sense, as it would be to the olfactory nerve to travel through filthy shambles, where neglect, and consequent putrefaction, had trebled the natural noisomeness of the place. These details exhibit human nature in its most hideous forms. Nothing meets the mind's eye, but fraud, forgery, and perjury; and, to crown the whole, the immolation, under the mockery of justice, of those wretched victims

* "I am here at such a distance from my authorities, that I cannot produce all the arguments which determined me to give the account you complain of, with regard to the Irish massacre. I only remember I sought truth, and thought I found it. The insurrection might be excused, as having liberty for its object. The violence also of the Puritanical Parliament, struck a just terror into all the Catholics. But the method of conducting the rebellion, if we must call it by that name, was certainly such, and you seem to own it, as deserved the highest blame, and was one of the most violent efforts of barbarism and bigotry united."[430] D. H.

[430] Curry, I. 215.

who had escaped the insatiate rage of Coote, Inchiquin, Orrery, Ireton, Cromwell, and their worthy followers.

Those who have attended courts of justice cannot have failed to observe the frightful frequency of perjury, so gross and so palpable, as not to escape the detection of the most superficial observer, often in cases of slight importance, and holding out, of course, little temptation to the perpetration of this dangerous crime. When, therefore, nearly the whole fee simple of a fertile island was at stake; when rapine made hasty strides in the confiscation of millions of acres; when an estate of one, two, three, or four hundred thousand acres depended, as was often the lamentable case, on the oath of a single perjured witness; when no witness was too base, too profligate, too infamous,—no testimony too extravagant, too incredible, too impossible, to be admitted, to prove the guilt, confiscate the property, or sacrifice the life, of an Irishman; had the tales embraced in those depositions been all plausible and consistent; had each corroborated the others; had there not been the slightest contradiction between them, still every sound and unprejudiced mind would receive the accusations with large drawbacks and allowances; knowing well, that strong temptations to fraud and villany will readily overcome the scruples of the profligate and abandoned part of mankind; that greater

temptations to fraud, forgery, and perjury, never existed; that they were never more kindly received or encouraged; and also knowing, that, during periods of civil war, when all the vile passions of human nature are let loose from their usual restraints,—when party rage, national antipathies, and religious persecution, all combine their deleterious influence, to demoralize and brutalize mankind, every species of profligacy and turpitude is nursed as in a hotbed.

But how revolting is the fact, that a large portion of this evidence, as we have mentioned, and wish indelibly impressed on the reader's mind, is sworn to on hear-say; that it is generally deficient of probability, and in many cases even of possibility; that it carries on its face the most irrefragable proofs of its utter falsehood, of the perjury of the witnesses, and of the wickedness of the judges and others who took the depositions! Many of those depositions, as may be seen in Chapter II. relate to circumstances utterly impossible; as the shrieking of ghosts, standing upright in rivers, crying for revenge; naked bodies, struck at with drawn swords, proving invulnerable; grease adhering to the knives of murderers, in sufficient quantities to make candles; persons cut and hacked, and their bowels torn out, without shedding their blood, &c. &c.

We have already stated, that all the depositions taken, at various times and places, to establish the guilt of the Irish, have been collected toge-

ther, and bound up in thirty-two volumes, which are paged, indexed, and preserved with care; and that from these Sir John Temple made a selection of those best calculated to answer his purpose. We may fairly presume, that, in forming his anthologia, he culled the sweetest flowers, and that those that remain are inferior to those he selected. Of the latter, we shall give such specimens, as cannot fail to excite the astonishment and horror of every man whose conscience is not seared with the hot iron of inextinguishable hatred to Ireland and Irishmen.

It may be a matter of surprise, why the tales were not dressed in better form;—why, since plausible stories cost the inventors as little talents or trouble as incredible ones, they did not frame consistent narratives, which would stand the test of examination, and not carry their own condemnation with them. The answer is obvious. The taste of the purchasers regulates the manufacture of every article; and the object being to bear down a nation hated for the injustice it had suffered, envied for the property it possessed, and devoted to destruction by religious bigotry and the spirit of rapine and plunder, the more terrible the tales, the more acceptable. The supernatural power of witches, and the apparition of ghosts, were as firmly believed, in those days of ignorance, as the existence and justice of the solemn league and covenant. Apparitions were therefore called in, as a necessary part of the

machinery, to prop the evidence of the horrifying massacre, and wonderfully heightened its effect. Millions of acres of land, and hundreds of lives, were sacrificed, to appease the manes of those, whose screaming, shrieking ghosts were, for months together, invoking vengeance on their murderers, at Portnedown bridge.

The depositions quoted by Temple, and which form the basis of his history, may be fairly divided into four classes:

I. Those which rest wholly on hearsay;

II. Those that assert things contrary to the order of nature; as the appearance of ghosts;

III. Those which are so manifestly improbable, as to preclude the assent of rational beings;

IV. Those which are drawn up without any internal evidence of their falsehood.

That the two first classes are to be rejected, without a moment's hesitation, no man will dare deny. That they ever were admitted, and that such men as Carte, Warner, Leland, and Hume, should have made them the basis on which they erected their legendary tales, will be matter of eternal astonishment.

The third class merits the same fate. We will give two instances, in illustration. May and Temple both state, that many of the English were so "*surbated*," by the fatigues of their flight from the murderous rebels, that they crawled into Dublin *on their knees!* To a person unacquainted with the geography of Ireland, it might appear

that these miserable fugitives, who were so "surbated,"* had travelled two or three thousand miles over sands or rocks, or both; and worn out not only their shoes and stockings, but their feet. He could not conceive that the most distant point of the north, from Dublin, was not a hundred and fifty miles; that the average distance of the chief seats of the insurrection was only about ninety; and the roads neither sandy nor stony. But when he is duly enlightened on these very abstruse points, and has reflected that a man not goaded on by apprehension of skeins or daggers, could with ease walk one hundred miles in five or six days; that with such powerful stimuli, he would probably travel them in three or four; that it is not usual, in three or four, or even in five or six days' travelling, to wear out either shoes or stockings; that even if the shoes or stockings were worn out, it requires a far greater extent of travelling to wear out the feet; and that there is no instance on record, of a man preferring to travel on his knees instead of his feet, especially when fleeing from assassins: when he has duly weighed these considerations, and various others that must arise in his mind, he will conclude, that no man would have ever devised such a

* "Some, over-wearied with long travel, and *so surbated as they came creeping on their knees!*"[431]

"Some, tired with travel, and *so surbated that they came into the city creeping on their knees!*"[432]

[431] Temple, 55. [432] May, 86.

wretched story, but an abandoned impostor; and that none would give credit to it, but those whose folly was exactly commensurate with the fraud of the narrator.

A large portion of the falsehoods that so universally abound in Irish history, display, as we have had frequent occasion to remark, an equal degree of stupidity and wickedness. This is a strong case in point. The idea of people flying from the skeins and daggers of assassins, and so "*surbated*," by a journey of fifty or a hundred miles, as to be obliged to creep or crawl on their knees, is so absurd, so ridiculous, so farcical, so improbable, as to excite contempt; and would itself, if it stood single, be almost sufficient to destroy the credit of any historian, who could seriously attempt to impose such a romance on the world.

We shall be pardoned for glancing at another case of the testimony of this class. Temple informs us, that some of those "*surbated*" fugitives, who were "*almost naked*," refused to cover themselves with clothes which were offered them; that they "*would not stir to fetch themselves food, though they knew where it stood ready for them;*" and that "*they lay in their own dung*."* Com-

* "Those of better quality, who could not frame themselves to be common beggars, crept into private places: and some of them, that had not private friends to relieve them, even wasted silently away, and so died without noise. I have known some of them that *lay almost naked, and having clothes sent, laid*

ment on such legends would be insulting to the understanding of the reader. We presume that every account of this description is nearly on a level with the story of the ghosts that were perched in the river, screaming for revenge, from Christmas till the end of lent;* and is entitled to the same unqualified rejection.

The fourth class alone is entitled to any consideration: and even that stands a fair chance of being involved in the same condemnation. Perjury was the order of the day: witnesses were suborned to shed innocent blood:† and where we

*them by, refusing to put them on!!!* Others that *would not stir to fetch themselves food, though they knew where it stood ready for them!!!* But they continued to lie nastily in their *filthy rags*, and even THEIR OWN DUNG!! not taking care to have any thing clean, handsome, or comfortable about them: and so even worn out with the misery of the journey, and cruel usage, having their spirits spent, their bodies wasted, and their senses failing, lay here pitifully languishing; and soon after they had recovered this town, *very many of them died, leaving their bodies as monuments of the most inhuman cruelties used towards them.* The greatest part of the women and children, thus barbarously expelled out of their habitations, perished in the city of Dublin: and so great numbers of them were brought to their graves, *as all the church-yards within the whole town were of too narrow a compass to contain.*"[433]

† The reader is requested to turn to the duke of Ormond's statement of the application to the Privy Council for the wages of prostitution;‡ that is, payment for money expended for hiring those witnesses whose "*feet were swift to shed innocent blood;*" and, above all, to the horrible fact of a jury finding one thousand bills of indictment in two days.§

* Supra, 42.

‡ Supra, 85.

[433] Temple, 55.

§ Supra, 84.

can establish, beyond contradiction, the absolute and unqualified perjury of so many of the witnesses, who swear positively to impossibilities, or to tales of "*what this body heard another body say*,"[434] and, above all, when such a man as Sir William Petty boasted that he "had witnesses that would swear through a three-inch board,"* we are warranted in rejecting even that small portion of the evidence which wears a plausible appearance; for it would be extraordinary, if none of the perjurers could tell a consistent story.

Those who have felt an interest in the support of fraud and imposture; whose blind prejudices rendered them insensible to the forgeries and perjuries on which Temple's history is grounded; or, to give their conduct a more favourable construction, who perhaps had never examined his book, have endeavoured to secure it a reputation and currency of which it is utterly unworthy. The most remarkable instances are William, bishop of Derry, about a century since, and a certain Francis Maseres, of the Inner Temple, of recent date. The former introduces Temple, in a strain of encomium suitable for a Livy or a Tacitus. "This *great man*," says he, "carries his story no further than the landing of Sir Simon Harcourt."[435] We shall soon hold "*this great man*"

* "Sir William Petty bragged, that he had got witnesses who would have sworn through a three-inch board to evict the duke."[436]

[434] Warner, 146. [435] Derry, 55. [436] Carte, II. 393.

up to the unqualified scorn of every liberal mind, and place in its proper light the fraud or the folly of the lord bishop of Derry.

Maseres, who has recently republished "May's History of the Long Parliament," pronounces the most extravagant encomiums on Temple,* the "authenticity" of whose "excellent history of the Irish rebellion," is, he says, "above all suspicion."

We would fondly hope, for the sake of their own reputation, that neither the bishop of Derry nor Mr. Maseres had read Temple's history, but had taken its character on trust; for it may be safely averred, that no man who has read it, or even those disgusting specimens which are here exhibited, can give the least credit to it, unless he be blind and deaf to the most common rules

* "Our loss on this occasion may be in some degree repaired, with respect to the state of Ireland during those two years, or at least during the first part of them, by having recourse to *the excellent History of the Irish Rebellion and Massacre*, in October, 1641, written by Sir John Temple, who was master of the rolls in Ireland, and a member of the king's Privy Council in Dublin, at the very time of its breaking out, and took a zealous and active part in the measures that were immediately employed for the preservation of that important city. This account of that horrid event *is universally allowed to be perfectly true and authentick!!* and is indeed made up, in a great degree, of the depositions of several persons who were *eye-witnesses!* of the various assaults, murders, and robberies of the poor Protestants, by their perfidious Popish neighbours, with whom they had been living in the most friendly and unsuspecting familiarity for almost forty years. *Its authenticity is therefore above all suspicion!!!*"[437]

[437] May, xiii.

of evidence; and no man who has so read it, will pretend to believe it, unless he means to delude and deceive.

These strong assertions require equally strong support: no other would bear us out, or warrant the use of them. We trust we shall satisfy the most fastidious reader, that, however pointed our reprobation of Temple's history, it is very far from over-strained. It will be an eternal subject of astonishment, how it has happened, that a lying legend, which carried a load of perjury sufficient "to sink a seventy-four," was ever able to support itself, and was not, with its wretched author,

"Damned to everlasting" infamy.

No reason would be sufficient, short of what we have already stated; that the confiscation of 10,000,000 acres of the soil of Ireland, projected by the London adventurers, sanctioned by the Long Parliament,* and in a great measure carried into effect by Oliver Cromwell, depended for its justification on this history, which interested so many thousands in the support of it, that, had it been incomparably more fabulous than it really is, their influence, particularly as they have, ever since its first appearance, been the dominant party in Ireland, would have rescued it from the noisome pool of shame, disgrace, and oblivion, into which it would otherwise have been precipitated.

* Supra, 64, 65.

## I. *Hearsay evidence.*

The reader will find, in the annexed notes,* full and complete corroboration of all our allega-

* "The examination of dame Butler, who, being duly sworn, deposeth that

"*She was credibly informed by Dorothy Renals*, who had been several times an eye-witness of these lamentable spectacles, that she had seen to the number of five and thirty English going to execution; and that she had seen them when they were executed, their bodies exposed to devouring ravens, and not afforded so much as burial.

"And this deponent saith, That *Sir Edward Butler did credibly inform her*, that James Butler, of Finyhinch, had hanged and put to death *all the English that were at Goran and Wells, and all thereabouts!!!*

"Jane Jones, servant to the deponent, did see the English formerly specified going to their execution; and, as she conceived, they were about the number of thirty-five; *and was told by Elizabeth Home*, that there were forty gone to execution. Jurat. Sept. 7, 1642. ANNE BUTLER."[438]

"Thomas Fleetwood, late curate of Killbeggan, in the county of Westmeath, deposeth, That *he hath heard from the mouths of the rebels themselves of great cruelties acted by them.* And, for one instance, that they stabbed the mother, one Jane Addis by name, and left her little sucking child, not a quarter old, by the corpse, and then they put the breast of its dead mother into its mouth, and bid it 'suck, English bastard,' and so left it there to perish. Jurat. March 22, 1642."[439]

"Richard Bourk, bachelor in divinity, of the county of Fermanagh, deposeth, That *he heard, and verily believeth*, the burning and killing of one hundred, at least, in the castle of Tullah, and that the same was done after fair quarter promised. Jurat. July 12, 1643."[440]

[438] Temple, 116, 117. [439] Idem, 107. [440] Idem, 84.

tions. They speak their own condemnation, and shed confusion and disgrace on those who have

" William Parkinson, of Castle-Cumber, in the county Kilkenny, gent. deposeth, That *by the credible report*, *both of English and some Irish*, who affirmed they were eye-witnesses of a bloody murder committed near Kilfeal, in the Queen's county, upon an Englishman, his wife, four or five children, and a maid, all which were hanged, by the command of Sir Morgan Cavanagh and Robert Harpool, and afterwards put all in one hole, the youngest child being not fully dead, put out the hand, and cried Mammy, Mammy, when without mercy they buried him alive. Jurat. February 11, 1642."[441]

" Owen Frankland, of the city of Dublin, deposeth, That *Michael Garray told this deponent*, that there was a Scotchman, who being driven by the rebels out of Newry, and knocked on the head by the Irish, recovered himself, and came again into the town naked, whereupon the rebels carried him and his wife out of the town, cut him all to pieces, and with a skein ripped his wife's belly, so as a child dropped out of her womb. Jurat. July 23, 1642."[442]

" Alexander Creighton, of Glaslough, in the county of Monaghan, gent. deposeth, That *he heard it credibly reported* among the rebels aforesaid, at Glaslough, that Hugh Mac O'Degan, a priest, had done a most meritorious act, in drawing betwixt forty and fifty English and Scotch, in the parish of Gonally, in the county of Fermanagh, to reconciliation with the church of Rome; and, after giving them the sacrament, demanded of them whether Christ's body was really in the sacrament or no? and they said, Yea. And that he demanded further, Whether they held the pope to be supreme head of the church? They likewise answered, He was. And that thereupon he presently told them, They were in good faith, and for fear they should fall from it, and turn heretics, he and the rest that were with him cut all their throats. Jurat. March 1, 1642."[443]

[441] Temple, 87. [442] Idem, 89. [443] Idem, 100.

employed them. There does not live a man, who has the slightest regard to his reputation,

"Richard Bourke, bachelor of divinity, deposeth, *that he was informed*, that Mr. Lodge, archdeacon of Killalow, being buried about six years since, and divers other ministers' bones were digged out of their graves as patrons of heresy, by direction of the titular bishop of Killalow; and Robert Jones, a minister, was not admitted Christian burial, by direction of some Popish priests. Jurat. July 12, 1643."[444]

"James, of Hacketstown, in the county of Catherlogh, deposeth, That *an Irish gentleman told him and others*, that he had turned an English woman away, who was his servant, and had a child, and that before the poor woman and child were gone half a mile, divers Irish women slew them with stones. Jurat. April 21, 1643."[445]

"John Clerck, of Knockback, gentleman, deposeth, That *he heard credibly from Mr. Lightbourne*, minister of the Naas, that the rebels shot a parish clerk, near Kildare, through his thighs, and afterwards digged a deep hole in the ground, wherein they set him upright on his feet, and filled up the hole in the earth, leaving out only his head, in which state they left the poor wounded man, till he pined, languished, and so died. Jurat. October 24, 1643."[446]

"Katherine, the relict of William Coke, of the county of Armagh, deposeth, That many of her neighbours, who had been prisoners among the rebels, *said and affirmed*, *that divers of the rebels would confess*, *brag and boast*, how they took an English Protestant, one Robert Wilkinson, at Kilmore, and held his feet in the fire until they burned him to death; and the said Robert Wilkinson's own son was present, and a prisoner, when that cruelty was exercised on his father. Jurat. February 24, 1643."[447]

"Dennis Kelly, of the county of Meath, deposeth, That Garret Tallon, of Cruisetown, in the said county, gentleman,

[444] Temple, 95.

[445] Idem, 93.

[446] Ibid.

[447] Ibid.

that will dare to justify or palliate the use of such materials of fraud. In common cases, they

*as is commonly reported*, hired two men to kill Anne Hagely, wife to Edward Tallon, his son, a Papist, and at that time absent from home; and the said two men did, in a most bloody manner, with skeins, kill the said Anne Hagely, and her daughter, and her daughter's two children, because they would not consent to go to mass; and after, they would not permit them to be buried in a church or church-yard, but the four were buried in a ditch. Jurat. August 23, 1643."[448]

"The examination of Joseph Wheeler, of Stancarty, in the county of Kilkenny, Esqr.; Elizabeth, the relict of William Gilbert, of captain Ridgway's company; Rebecca Hill, the relict of Thomas Hill, late lieutenant to the said captain Ridgway; Thomas Lewis, late of Kilkenny, gent.; and Patrick Maxwell, of the Graig, in the same county, gent. sworn and examined, depose and say,

"*That they have credibly heard and believed*, that Florence Fitz-Patrick having enticed a rich merchant of Mountwrath to his the said Fitz-Patrick's house, to bring thither his goods, which he promised should be safely protected and safely redelivered: he the said Florence Fitz-Patrick possessing those goods, afterwards caused the said merchant and his wife to be hanged; *and they have credibly heard*, that the said Florence Fitz-Patrick also hanged lieutenant Keiss and his son, one Hughes, a school-master, and divers other Protestants."[449]

"The examination of Jane, the wife of Thomas Stewart, late of the town and county of Kilkenny, merchant, sworn and examined before his majesty's commissioners, in that behalf authorized, deposeth and saith:

"All the men, women, and children of the British that then could be found within the same town (saving this deponent, *who was so sick that she could not stir*) were summoned to go into the gaol, and as many as could be met with, all were carried and put into the gaol, where, about twelve o'clock in the night, they were stripped stark naked, and after most of them

[448] Temple, 92. [449] Idem, 117.

might be allowed to pass without comment, which would then be wholly superfluous: but in

were most cruelly and barbarously murdered with swords, axes, and skeins, and particularly by two butchers, named James Buts and Robert Buts, of Sligo, who murdered many of them; wherein also were actors, Charles O'Connor, the friar, and Hugh O'Connor aforenamed, brother to the said Teigue O'Connor, Kedagh O'Hart, labourer, Richard Walsh and Thomas Walsh, the one the jailor, the other a butcher, and divers others whom she cannot name: and saith, that above thirty of the British which were so put into the gaol, were then and there murdered: besides Robert Gumble, then provost of the said town of Sligo, Edward Nusham, and Edward Mercer, who were wounded and left for dead amongst the rest, and Joe Stewart, this deponent's son, which four being the next day found alive, yet all besmeared with blood, were spared to live. *All which particulars the deponent was credibly told by those that escaped, and by her Irish servants and others of the town:* and saith, that some of the women so murdered being big with child (by their wounds received) the very arms and legs of the children in their wombs appeared, and were thrust out; and one woman, viz. Isabel Beard, being in the house of the friars, and hearing the lamentable cry that was made, ran into the street, and was pursued by one of the friar's men unto the river, where she was barbarously murdered, and found the next day, with the child's feet appearing and thrust out of her wounds in her sides: and further saith, that on the said sixth day of January, there were murdered in the streets of the town of Sligo, these British Protestants following, viz. William Shiels and John Shiels, his son, William Mapwell and Robert Akin: and the deponent further saith, *(as she was credibly informed by the persons before named)* that the inhuman rebels, after their murders committed in the said gaol, laid and placed some of the dead bodies of the naked murdered men upon the naked bodies of the women, in a most immodest posture, not fit for chaste ears to hear: in which posture they continued to be seen the next morning by those Irish of the town that came into the said goal, who were delighted in those bloody murders and uncivil actions; and that

the present extraordinary and unparalleled one, more than usual care is necessary, to probe the

they of the Irish, that came to bury them, *stood up to the mid-leg in the blood and brains of those that were so murdered!!!* who were carried out, and cast into a pit digged for that purpose, in the garden of Mr. Ricrofts, minister of Sligo."[450]

"John Birne, late of Dongannon, in the county Tyrone, deposeth, That *he heard some of the native Irish*, that were somewhat more merciful than the rest, complain that two young cow-boys, within the parish of Tullah, had at several times murdered and drowned thirty-six women and children. Jurat. January 12, 1643."[451]

"William Lucas, of the city of Kilkenny, deposeth, That although he lived in the town till about five or six weeks past, in which time *he is assured* divers murders and cruel acts were committed, *yet he durst not go abroad to see any of them;* but *he doth confidently believe*, that the rebels having brought seven Protestants' heads, whereof one was the head of Mr. Bingham, a minister, they did then and there, as triumphs of their victories, set them upon the market-cross, on a market day; and that the rebels slashed, stabbed, and mangled those heads; put a gag, or carrot, in the said Mr. Bingham's mouth; slit up his cheeks to his ears, laying a leaf of a Bible before him, and bid him preach, for his mouth was wide enough; and after they had solaced themselves, threw those heads into a hole, in St. James's Green. Jurat. August 16, 1643."[452]

"Christian Stanhaw, the relict of Henry Stanhaw, late of the county of Armagh, Esquire, deposeth, that a woman that formerly lived near Laugale, *absolutely informed this deponent*, that the rebels enforced a great number of Protestants, men, women, and children, into a house which they set on fire, purposely to burn them; as they did; and still as any of them offered to come out, to shun the fire, the wicked rebels, with sithes, which they had in their hands, cut them in pieces, and cast them into the fire, and burned them with the rest. Jurat. July 23, 1642."[453]

[450] Temple, 108.
[451] Idem, 97.
[452] Idem, 97.
[453] Idem, 94.

ulcerated wound, and heal the disordered state of the public mind, on the most stupendous sys-

" John Montgomery, of the county of Monaghan, sworn and examined, saith, That one Brian Mac Erony, ringleader of the rebels in the county of Fermanagh, killed ensign Flöyd, Robert Worcnum, and four of their servants, one of which they having wounded, though not to death, they buried quick. As also, that *he was credibly informed*, that the daughter-in-law of one Foard, in the parish of Clownish, being delivered of a child in the fields, the rebels, who had formerly killed her husband and father, killed her and two of her children, and suffered the dogs to eat up and devour her new-born child. Jurat. June 26, 1642."[454]

" John Stubs, of the county of Longford, gentleman, deposeth, That *he heard, by some of the sheriff's men*, that Henry Mead and his wife, John Bigel, William Stell, and Daniel Stubs, the deponent's brother, were put to death by Lysach Farrol's and Oli Fitz-gerrald's men, who hanged them upon a windmill, and, when they were half dead, they cut them to pieces with their skeins. Jurat. Nov. 21, 1641."[455]

" Charity Chappel, late wife to Richard Chappel, esquire, of the town and county of Armagh, deposeth, That, *as she hath credibly heard*, the rebels murdered great numbers of Protestants, and that many children were seen murdered in vaults and cellars, whither they fled to hide themselves. Jurat. July 2, 1642."[456]

*Extract from the Deposition of John Carmick.*

" Twenty-two castles were seized upon, and the church of Monah, with eighteen Protestants burnt in it: seven hundred and sixty-four Protestants were destroyed in that county; and *I did hear that there were about* 152,000, *that they had destroyed in that province of Ulster, in the first four months of the rebellion.* JOHN CARMICK."[457]

[454] Temple, 89.
[455] Idem, 90.
[456] Idem, 90.
[457] Idem, 225.

tem of imposture that the world has ever seen. We shall therefore analyze two of those depositions, the most remarkable of the whole.

Of all the witnesses who have sworn to the large collection of legendary tales, on the subject of the pretended massacre and cruelties of the Irish, there is none on whom so much reliance has been placed as dean Robert Maxwell, afterwards bishop of Kilmore. His clerical character appeared calculated to produce, and did inspire confidence. His testimony is therefore a fair subject of discussion. If it pass the ordeal of investigation, and come out pure and perfectly admissible, it will afford a favourable augury for the rest: but if it be abandoned as utterly indefensible, without possibility of appeal, then its

"Thomas Green, in the parish of Dumcaes, in the county Armagh, yeoman, and Elizabeth his wife, sworn and examined, saith, That the deponent, Thomas Green, hardly escaped away with his life; but that the other deponent and six children were left all amongst the rebels, and so stripped of their clothes, and hunger-starved, that five of the children died; and she, this deponent, being put to beg amongst the merciless rebels, was at length rescued from them by the Scottish army: she further saith, that the rebels did drown, in a bog, seventeen men, women, and children, at one time, within the said parish; *and she is verily persuaded that the rebels*, *at several times and places within the county of Armagh*, *drowned above four thousand Protestants*, *enforcing the sons and daughters of those very aged people*, who were not able to go themselves, to take them out of their beds and houses, and carry them to drowning, especially in the river of Toll, in the parish of Loghall. Jurat. November 10, 1643."[458]

[458] Temple, 91.

condemnation involves that of the elaborate productions of all his fellow-labourers. Indeed we should be willing to rest the merits of the case on this individual deposition; and hope to prove that a more crude, wild, extravagant, and ridiculous farrago of absurdity and falsehood was never offered to the "greedy maw" of public credulity and cullibility. The specimens we have already given, on the subject of the ghosts,* and the gross contradiction respecting the number of 154,000 massacred,† would be enough to prove that he had

"Laid perjury on his soul."

But we deem it by no means improper to offer to the consideration of the reader, another collection of extracts‡ from the evidence of this

‡ *Extracts from the Deposition of Dean Robert Maxwell, sworn to, August* 22, 1642.

"Deponent saith, That *the rebels themselves told him*, this deponent, that they murdered nine hundred fifty-four in one morning, in the county of Antrim; and that, besides them, *they supposed* they killed above eleven or twelve hundred more in that county: *they told him likewise*, that colonel Brian O'Neil killed about a thousand in the county of Down, besides three hundred killed near Killeleigh, and many hundreds, both before and after, in both those counties.[459]

"That *he heard Sir Phelim likewise report*, that he killed six hundred English at Garvagh, in the county of Derry; and that he had left neither man, woman nor child alive in the barony of Wunterlong, in the county of Tyrone, and betwixt Armagh and the Newry, in the several plantations and lands

* Supra, 46. † Supra, 45.

[459] Temple, 113. Borlace, App. 135.

reverend divine, to satisfy the most incredulous readers, what a miserable support can be afforded to the tale of the massacre, by such a voucher.

The dean swears, with great gravity, in one part of his deposition, that "there were upwards

of Sir Archibald Atcheson, John Hamilton, Esq. the lord Caulfield, and the lord Mountnorris: and saith also, that there were above two thousand of the British murdered for the most part in their own houses, *whereof he was informed by a Scotsman*, who was in those parts with Sir Phelim, and saw their houses filled with their dead bodies. In the Glenwood, towards Dromore, there were slaughtered, *as the rebels told the deponent*, *upwards of twelve thousand in all*, who were all killed in their flight to the county of Down. The number of the people drowned at the bridge of Portnedown are diversely reported, according as men staid amongst the rebels. This deponent, who staid as long as any, and *had better intelligence* than most of the English amongst them, and best reason to know the truth, saith, There were *(by their own report)* one hundred and ninety drowned with Mr. Fullerton; at another time, they threw one hundred and forty over the said bridge; at another time, thirty-six or thirty-seven; and so continued drowning more or fewer, for seven or eight weeks, so as *the fewest which can be supposed* there to have perished, must needs be above one thousand, besides as many more drowned between that bridge and the great lough of Montjoy, besides those that perished by the sword, fire, and famine, in Coubrasil, and the English plantations adjacent; which, in regard there escaped not three hundred out of all these quarters, must needs amount to many thousands.[460]

"And further saith, that he knew *one boy*, that dwelt near unto himself, and *not exceeding fourteen years of age, who killed, at Kinnard, in one night, fifteen able strong men with his skein, they being disarmed, and most of their feet in the stocks.* Another, not above twelve years of age, *killed two*

[460] Temple, 113. Borlace, 135.

of 12,000 slain in the Glenwood, *as the rebels told this deponent;*" there were "954 murdered in one morning, *as the rebels themselves told him;*" there were, moreover, "above 2,000 murdered in their own houses, *as he was informed by a Scotsman;*" and Sir Phelim O'Neil had

*women*, at the siege of Augher. A woman, tenant to the deponent, *killed seven men and women of her English fellow-tenants in one morning;* and it was very usual, in all parts, for *their children to murder the Protestants' children;* and sometimes with lath swords, heavy and well sharpened, they would venture upon men and women of riper years, cruelties not to be believed, if there were not so many eye-witnesses of them."[461]

"And further saith, That the rebels would send their children abroad in great troops, and especially near unto Kinnard, armed with long wattles and whips, who would therewith beat dead men's bodies about their privy members, until they beat or rather thrashed them off; then would return in great joy to their parents, who received them for such service as it were in triumph."[462]

"Further, this deponent saith, That it was usual sport with one Mac-Mahon, captain of the castle and town of Monaghan, (as *the said Mac-Mahon confessed* before Mr. Hugh Echline and many others) to take a wooden prick or broach, and thrust it up into the fundament of an English or Scotchman, and then after drive him about the room with a joint stool, until, through extreme pain, he either fainted, or gave content to the spectators by some notable skips and frisks; which rare invention he offered to put in practice at the same time, and in the same place where he boasted thereof, but that the said Mr. Echline prevailed with him to omit it, as sufficiently (without any further demonstration) believing the excellency of the sport."[463]

[461] Borlace, App. 136. [462] Temple, 113.
[463] Borlace, App. 138.

"left neither man, woman, nor child alive, from Armagh to Newry, *as he heard Sir Phelim himself report*."

The inhumanity of the Irish to the English beasts, according to the dean, was really shocking. They used to cut collops off their backs, and then let them loose in the woods, *till*, O miraculous! *they roared the flesh off their backs!* This fit of roaring would sometimes last for two or three days together!*

But the most marvellous part of the story is, that the dogs and cocks became traitors! and appear to have entered into a league with the rebels!! For, during "the three first days of the rebellion," they neither crowed nor barked, to alarm their masters, "not even when the rebels came by night, in great multitudes, to rob and murder them!!!"†

* "At the siege of Augher, they would not kill any English beast, and then eat it; but they cut collops out of them, being alive; *letting them roar till they had no more flesh upon their backs*, so that sometimes a beast would live two or three days together in that torment."[464]

† "And the deponent further saith, That the first three days and nights of this present rebellion, viz. October 23, 24, and 25, *it was generally observed, that no cock crew, or any dog was heard to bark, no not when the rebels came in great multitudes unto the Protestants' houses by night to rob and murder them;* and about three or four nights before the six and fifty persons were taken out of the deponent's house and drowned, and amongst those the deponent's brother, lieutenant James Maxwell, in the dark of the moon, about one of the

[464] Temple, 112. Borlace, 133.

Who can wade through such a miserable mass of folly and fraud, without bitterly exclaiming,

"How God and good men hate so foul a liar?"[465]

Stratford's deposition* is exactly of the same character as Maxwell's; and is so distinctly and

clock at night, *a light was observed, in manner of a long pillar, to shine for a long way through the air, and refracted upon the north gabel of the house. It gave so great a light, about an hour together*, that *divers of the watch read both letters and books of a very small character thereby.* The former the deponent knoweth to be most true, both by his own experience, and the general observation of as many as the deponent met with in the county Armagh. The latter was seen by all those of the deponent's family, and besides by many of his Irish guard.

"Robert Maxwell.

"Deposed, August 22, 1642.
"John Watson,
"William Aldrich."[466]

* "Captain Anthony Stratford deposeth and saith, that "These Protestant ministers following, about the beginning of the present rebellion, were murdered in the counties of Tyrone and Armagh, viz. Mr. John Mathew, Mr. Blythe, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Smith, Mr. Darragh, Mr. Birge, and eight more, whose names this deponent hath forgotten, by the rebels, none of which would the rebels permit to be buried; the names of such as murdered, this examinant knoweth not; *his cause of knowledge of the said murders is, that some of his, this deponent's servants, who were among the rebels, did give him the relation!!! and he verily believeth them;* and besides, this deponent heard the same confessed and averred by many of the rebels themselves, and by some of those Protestants that had escaped: and that he this deponent was a prisoner among the rebels, at Castlecaufield, near the place of those murders, WHERE HE CONTINUED FOURTEEN MONTHS! And further

[465] Shakspeare. [466] Borlace, App. 136, 137.

legibly stamped with the broad seal of perjury, that even the most superficial observer cannot mistake its character.

saith, that in Dungannon, in the county of Tyrone, or near thereunto, the rebels murdered three hundred and sixteen Protestants; and between Charlemont and Dungannon, above four hundred; that there were murdered and drowned at and in the river of Benburb, the Black water, between the counties of Armagh and Tyrone, two hundred and six Protestants; and Patrick Mac-Crew, of Dungannon, aforesaid, murdered thirty-one in one morning; and *two young rebels, John Begbrian and Harry, murdered in the said county of Tyrone, one hundred and forty poor women and children* that could make no resistance: and that the wife of Brien Kelly, of Loghall, in the county of Armagh, (one of the rebels' captains,) *did with her own hands murder forty-five.* And deponent further saith, that one Thomas King, sometimes sergeant to the late lord Caufield's company (which this deponent commanded) he being forced to serve under the rebels, and was one of the provost marshals, gave the deponent a list of every householder's name so murdered, and the number of the persons so murdered; *which list this deponent durst not keep:* At Portnedown there were drowned at several times about three hundred and eight, who were sent away by about forty, or such like numbers at once, with convoys, and there drowned: There was a lough near Loghall aforesaid, where were drowned above two hundred, *of which this deponent was informed by several persons*, and particularly by the wife of doctor Hodges, and two of her sons, who were present and designed for the like end: but by God's mercy, that gave them favour in the eyes of some of the rebels, they escaped; and the said Mrs. Hodges and her sons gave the deponent a list of the names of many of those that were so drowned, which *the deponent durst not keep;* and saith that the said doctor Hodges was employed by Sir Phelim O'Neil to make powder; but he failing of his undertaking, was first half hanged, then cut down, and kept prisoner three months, and then murdered with forty-four more, within a quarter of a mile of Charlemont aforesaid, they being

The insurrection began on the 23d of October, 1641. The deposition of this man was taken on

by Tirlogh O'Neil, brother to Sir Phelim, sent to Dungannon, prisoners, and in the way murdered. This deponent was showed the pit where they were all cast in.

"At a mill pond in the parish of Kilamen, in the county of Tyrone, there were drowned in one day three hundred, and in the same parish there were murdered of English and Scottish twelve hundred, *as this deponent was informed by Mr. Birge, the late minister of the said parish*,* who certified the same under his hand, *which note the deponent durst not keep:* the said Mr. Birge was murdered three months after: all which murders were in the first breaking out of the rebellion, but the particular times this deponent cannot remember, neither the persons by whom they were committed. *This deponent was credibly informed by the said sergeant and others of this deponent's servants* (who kept company with the rebels,) and saw the same, that many young children were cut into quarters and gobbets by the rebels, and that eighteen Scottish infants were hanged on a clothier's tenterhook, and that they murdered a young fat Scottish man, and *made candles of his grease;* they took another Scottish man and ripped up his belly, that they might come to his small guts, the one end whereof they tied to a tree, and made him go round until he had drawn them all out of his body; they then saying, that *they would try whether a dog's or a Scotchman's guts were the longer.*

"ANTHONY STRATFORD.

"Deposed, March 9, 1643, before us,

"HENRY JONES,

"HENRY BRERETON."[467]

* The wonderful density of the population of this parish, where fifteen hundred persons were murdered, might excite doubts, but for the circumstance, that this important fact was "*certified by Mr. Birge, under his own hand.*" It is much to be regretted that the deponent "*durst not keep*" this valuable document, which was worthy of being preserved in the archives of Ireland.

[467] Temple, 110.

the 9th of March, 1643; that is, above sixteen months from the time when it commenced. By his own account, he was for *fourteen months a prisoner!!* He does not state when he was first confined; but we will suppose one month after the first date, and that he was released one month before the second. Yet he swears positively to various circumstances, which he pretends occurred, in different parts of the province, during his imprisonment, with as much confidence as if he had been an eye-witness of the whole; and so shameless was the villain, so profligate were the wretched magistrates who took his deposition, so abandoned was the spirit of the age, that he, without scruple, avowed his perjury, by stating the sources of his information, which were as various as the different items of his testimony. In one case, "*some of his servants, who were among the rebels, did give him the information;*" in another, "*Thomas King did give him a list of the householders so murdered;*" in another, "*the wife of Dr. Hodges and her two sons gave him a list;*" in another, the murder of fifteen hundred in one parish is "*certified by Mr. Birge, under his own hand;*" and in this manner, he proceeds throughout the whole deposition.

We now close the first class of the testimony, on which the wretched legend of the Irish massacre rests. We trust the reader will agree that it fully realizes Warner's description, and is nothing more than a collection of "*idle, silly tales.*"

of "*what this body heard another body say.*"[468] One man swears, that he "*heard, and verily believeth;*" another, that he "*heard it credibly reported* among the rebels themselves;" a third, that "*an Irish gentleman told him and others;*" a fourth, that "*he was informed;*" and a fifth, that "*a woman absolutely informed this deponent;*" and similar ribald nonsense, to which nothing but the spirit of fraud, falsehood, perjury, and rapine, that predominated among the rulers of Ireland at that period, could have given currency; and which would not, at present, be admitted as evidence, by the most paltry, pettifogging justice of the peace, against the lowest wretch in the community.

Is there a man, not lost to every sense of honour and justice, who can read this account without horror, amazement, indignation, and regret? horror at the atrocious wickedness of the host of perjurers, who were thus made the instruments to plunder the property and sacrifice the lives of the ill-fated Irish; amazement at the Bœotian and superlative stupidity of those who committed themselves by perjuries open to the detection of the most superficial observer; indignation at the base imposture, or gross neglect, which has led so many subsequent writers, particularly Hume, to poison the pure streams of history, by recourse to such a pestilential source as this vile, this ribald story; and profound regret, if he

[468] Warner, 146.

have hitherto, as is most probable, been deluded into a belief in one of the most wicked, base, and unfounded romances ever palmed on a deceived world, in the shape of history.

Of the second class of depositions, those which assert things contrary to the known laws of nature, we have given so many examples, pages 41 to 46, that we deem it wholly unnecessary to disgrace our work with any further instances; except one extravagant tale, contained in the deposition of dean Maxwell, which we omitted in its proper place. This reverend perjurer swore, that the dead bodies of murdered Englishmen lay unburied, *and would not sometimes begin to stink and infect the air, until four or five weeks after the murders committed!* He that can swallow this story, must be endowed with faith enough to receive, as genuine history, the Arabian Nights' Entertainments, Gulliver's Travels, and the Seven Champions of Christendom.

"And further this deponent saith, That the rebels having exposed the murdered bodies of the British so long unto the public view and censure, that they began to stink and infect the air, which commonly (being a thing very strange) *would not sometimes happen till four or five weeks after the murders committed!!!!* they usually permitted some of their bodies to be removed and cast into ditches."[469]

We shall now proceed to a cursory examination of the third class, which, though not resting

[469] Borlace, App. 138.

on hearsay, or not absolutely impossible, are yet so utterly improbable, as to be unworthy of belief.

One of the witnesses swears, that she and her six children *had nothing to eat for three weeks, while they lay in a cave, but two old calf skins,* which they beat with stones, and ate them *hair and all!**

Another, seventy-five years old, swears that she was *stripped seven times in one day*, by the rebels, as she was proceeding to Dublin.†

Another swears, that *all the nobles in the kingdom, that were Papists, had a hand in the plot.* It is too obvious to require illustration, that even if this were a fact, it was hardly possible for any man to be so well assured of it, as to be able safely to take this sweeping oath. But, setting

* "Mary Barlow deposeth, That her husband being by the rebels hanged before her face, she and six children were stripped stark naked, and turned out a begging in the frost and snow, by means whereof they were almost starved, *having nothing to eat in three weeks, while they lay in a cave, but two old calf skins, which they beat with stones, and so ate them hair and all,* her children crying out unto her, rather to go out, and be killed by the rebels, than to starve there."[470]

† "Margaret Fermeny, in the county of Fermanagh, deposeth, that the rebels bound her and her husband's hands behind them, to make them confess their money, and dragged them up and down in a rope, and cut his throat in her own sight with a skein, having first knocked him down and stripped him; and that being an aged woman, seventy-five years old, as she came up afterwards to Dublin, she was stripped by the Irish *seven times in one day.*"[471]

[470] Temple, 90. [471] Idem, 88.

this consideration wholly aside, the perjury is proved by the simple fact, that the earl of Clanrickarde, and other Catholic noblemen, were not only wholly unconcerned in the insurrection, but absolutely fought against their countrymen.*

Another swears, that two and twenty widows were *stripped stark naked*, and driven out into the woods, where they remained in that condition *from Tuesday till Saturday, and the snow unmelted lay long on some of their skins!*†

* "Patrick O'Brien, of the parish of Galloom, in the county of Fermanagh, affirmeth, upon oath, That *all the nobles in the kingdom, that were Papists, had a hand in this plot*, as well as the lord Macguire, Hugh Oge, and Mac-Mahown; that they expected aid out of Spain, by Owen Roe O'Neal; and that colonel Plunket, one of those that was to be an actor in the surprise of the castle of Dublin, told him that he knew of this plot eight years since; and that within these three years, he hath been more fully acquainted with it."[472]

† "Magdalen Redman, late of the Dowris, in King's county, widow, being sworn and examined, deposeth and saith, that she, this deponent, and divers other Protestants, her neighbours, and amongst the rest twenty-two widows, after they were all robbed, were also stripped, stark naked, and then covering themselves in a house with straw, the rebels then and there lighted the straw with fire, and threw amongst them, on purpose to burn them; where they had been burned or smothered, but that some of the rebels more pitiful than the rest, commanded these cruel rebels to forbear, so as they escaped: yet the rebels kept and *drove them naked into the wild woods, from Tuesday until Saturday*, in frost and snow, so *as the snow unmelted, lay long upon some of their skins!!!* and some of their children died in their arms."[473]

[472] Temple, 61. [473] Idem, 81.

It were endless to recapitulate the miserable tales with which Temple's history is filled: they are as nauseating by their absurdity, as shocking by their falsehood. A few more shall close the subject.

This writer very gravely informs us, that the day previous to the breaking out of the rebellion, the priests in many places "*gave the people a dismiss at mass*, with the liberty to go and take possession of the Englishmen's lands, and to strip, rob, and despoil them of all their goods and cattle;"*

That the Irish were determined, as soon as they had rooted out the English from Ireland, to "go to England, and not leave the memorial of the English name under heaven!"†

* "Whereas the priests did long before, in their public devotions at mass, pray for a blessing upon a great design they had then in hand; so now, as I have heard, they did in many places, *the very day before the breaking out of this rebellion, give the people a dismiss at mass, with free liberty to go out, and take possession of all their lands*, which they pretended were unjustly detained from them by the English; as also to strip, rob, and despoil them of all their goods and cattle."[474]

† "The friars exhorted the people with tears to spare none of the English; that the Irish were resolved to destroy them out of the kingdom; that they would devour, as their very word was, the seed of the English out of Ireland; and that when they had rid them there, *they would go over into England, and not leave the memorial of the English name under heaven!!!*"[475]

[474] Temple, 79. [475] Idem, 78.

That the Irish killed English cows and sheep, merely because they were English ;*

That some of those that fled from Ireland, to seek refuge in England, were so tossed about by storms, that they could not reach any port in the latter island in *three months;*†

That the Irish intended to have heavy penalties imposed on those who should speak English ;‡

* "The Irish in many places *killed English cows and sheep, merely because they were English;* in some places *they cut off their legs, or took a piece out of their buttocks,* and so let them remain, still alive. The Lord Montgarret, Mr. Edward Butler, the Baron of Logmouth, went with their forces into Munster, about the beginning of the rising of the Irish there, and while they remained about Callen and Mallow, they consumed no less than fifty thousand, others say an hundred thousand English sheep, besides a great abundance of English cattle: and such as they could not eat, yet they killed and left in great multitudes, stinking, to the great annoyance of the country. This testified by Henry Champart, in his examination taken before Sir Robert Meredith, knight."[476]

† "That which heightened the calamity of the poor English was their flight in the winter, in such a dismal, stormy, tempestuous season, as in the memory of man had never been observed formerly to continue so long together. Yet the terror of the rebels incomparably prevailing beyond the rage of the sea, most of those who could provide themselves of shipping, though at never so excessive rates, deserted the city: and such was the violence of the winds, such continuing impetuous storms, as several barques were cast away. *Some, in three months after their going from hence, could recover no port in England!*"[477]

‡ "Some of the Irish could not endure the very sound of that language, but would have penalties inflicted on them that spake English."[478]

[476] Temple, 77. [477] Idem, 57. [478] Idem, 77.

That they would not leave an English man or woman alive in the kingdom; no, not so much as an English beast, or any of the breed of them;*

That in the beginning of the insurrection, the English had such confidence in the Irish, that they delivered their goods to them for safe keeping, and even dug up such of their best things as they had hidden under ground, to deposit in their custody;†

That *many thousands* died in two days, in the town of Colerain; a place not containing, probably, five hundred people;‡

That children were compelled to be the executioners of their parents; wives to help to hang their husbands; and mothers to cast their children into the water;§

* "Richard Claybrook deposeth, That he heard Luke Toole say, that they would not leave an Englishman or English woman in the kingdom; *that they would not leave an English beast alive, or any of the breed of them.*"[479]

† "So confident were the English of their good dealing at first, as many delivered their goods by retail unto them; gave them particular inventories of all they had; nay, digged up such of their best things as they had hidden under ground, to deposit in their custody."[480]

‡ "James Redfern deposeth, That in the town of Colerain, since the rebellion began, there died of robbed and stripped people, that fled thither for succour, many hundreds, besides those of the town that anciently dwelt there: and that the mortality there was such and so great, as *many thousands* died there in two days."[481]

§ "Children were enforced to carry their aged parents to the places designed for their slaughter; nay, some children

[479] Temple, 96. [480] Idem, 80. [481] Idem, 81.

That the destruction of the Christians, in any of the heathen persecutions, in any one kingdom, was not greater, *in many years*, than the destruction of the English by the Irish, in the space of *two months!!**

That the Irish used to twist withes about the heads of the English, till the blood sprang out of the crowns of their heads !†

That a murderer's wife found much fault with her husband's soldiers, for not bringing home the grease of a woman whom they had slain, for the purpose of making candles ;‡

compelled most unnaturally to be the executioners of their own parents; wives to help to hang their husbands; and mothers to cast their own children into the water."[482]

* "If we shall take a survey of the primitive times, and look into the sufferings of the first Christians that suffered under the tyranny and cruel persecution of those heathenish emperors, we shall not certainly find *any one kingdom*, though of a far larger continent, where there were more Christians suffered, or more unparalleled cruelties were acted *in many years* upon them, than were in Ireland, *within the space of two months*, after the breaking out of this rebellion."[483]

† "Some they would take and writh wyths about their heads, till the blood sprang out of the crown of their heads."[484]

‡ "Elizabeth Baskervile deposeth, That *she heard the wife of Florence Fitz-Patrick, find much fault with her husband's soldiers*, because they did not bring along with them the grease of Mrs. Nicholson, whom they had slain, for her to make candles withal. Jurat. April 26, 1643."[485]

[482] Temple, 91. [483] Idem, 100.
[484] Idem, 106. [485] Idem, 92.

That the English were such dupes, that they lent their weapons to the Irish.*

The following extract from Temple's history, with the depositions ón which it is grounded, may serve to amuse the reader, and will throw additional light on the mode in which that romance was compiled:

"How grievous and insupportable must it needs be to a true Christian soul, to hear a base villain boast, that his hands were so weary with killing and knocking down Protestants into a bog, that *he could not lift his arms up to his head?*† or others to say, that they had killed so many Englishmen, that *the grease or fat which remained on their swords or skeins might have made an Irish candle?*‡ or to consider that two young cow-boys should have it in their power to murder thirty-six Protestants?"[486]

The instances of mental obliquity exhibited by the Anglo-Hibernian writers, which we have

* "In several places, the Irish came, under divers pretences, and *borrowed such weapons as the English had in their houses;* and no sooner got them into their hands, but they turned them out of their own doors: as they did at Glaslough, in the county of Monaghan. The high sheriff there being an Irishman and a Papist, pretending that *he took their arms* to secure them against the violence of such of the Irish as he understood to be in arms in the next county."[487]

† "Eleanor Fullerton, the relict of William Fullerton, late parson, of Lougall, deposeth, That in lent, 1641, a young roguing cow-boy gave out and affirmed, in this deponent's hearing, that *his hands were so weary in killing and knocking down Protestants into a bog-pit, that he could hardly lift his arms to his head.* Jurat. Sept. 16, 1642."[488]

‡ "Elizabeth Champion, late wife of Arthur Champion, in the county of Fermanagh, esquire, saith, That she heard the rebels say, that they had killed so many Englishmen, that *the*

[486] Temple, 96. [487] Idem, 37. [488] Idem, 96.

heretofore noticed, are numerous and extraordinary. A new one here presents itself.

The spirit of lying and imposture which pervades those depositions, would naturally induce a sane mind to reject them wholly, as undeserving of any attention. But, by a most perverted process of reasoning, Leland ascribes these awful stories to the terrors excited by the horrible cruelties perpetrated by the Irish, which, he supposes, preyed on the imaginations of the English, and terrified them with the idea of lakes and rivers of blood, &c. &c.

> "They who escaped the utmost fury of the rebels, languished in miseries horrible to be described. *Their imaginations were overpowered and disordered by the recollections of torture and butchery.* In their distraction," [let us say, rather, in the depraved and loathsome state of the public mind] "*every tale of horror was eagerly received, and every suggestion of frenzy and melancholy believed implicitly. Miraculous escapes from death, miraculous judgments on murderers, lakes and rivers of blood, marks of slaughter indelible by every human effort, visions of spirits chaunting hymns, ghosts rising from the rivers and shrieking out revenge;* these and such like fancies were received and propagated as incontestible."[489]

It is difficult to conceive of a stronger proof of the blindest prejudice than is here exhibited by Leland. Whoever has travelled through the wretched legends which disgrace and dishonour

*grease or fat which remained on their swords and skeins, might well serve to make an Irish candle.* Jurat. April 14, 1642."[490]

[489] Leland, III. 147. [490] Temple, 97.

the preceding pages, will at once perceive that the object with the perjurers who wrote them, was to render their tales as terrific and horrible as they could, for the purpose of aggravating the abhorrence, and ensuring the ruin, of the oppressed and despoiled Irish. They were quite certain, that in the prevailing spirit of the times, no improbability or impossibility would be a bar to their currency. This is so plain and palpable, that it requires only to skim the surface, to perceive it. Instead, therefore, of believing, with Leland, that a man who coolly comes forward, and swears to "lakes and rivers of blood," and "visions of spirits chaunting hymns," acts under the influence of a disordered imagination, in consequence of the horrors he has witnessed, we are warranted, nay constrained to believe, that the whole is the creation not of a disordered, but a corrupted and lying imagination. Indeed, we are perfectly satisfied, that there is not one of our readers, who will allow his understanding free operation, but will find it impossible to believe that those terror-inspiring stories could have ever proceeded from any other source than the prince of darkness, the father of lies.

We feel that confidence which truth and a good cause inspire, that we have convinced every candid reader, that the ground we have taken is perfectly sound and unassailable; and therefore we might here dismiss this branch of our subject: but we cannot resist the temptation to add one

further proof of the magnitude of the errors that have prevailed on the subject of the universality of the insurrection. This proof rests on authority which the enemies of Ireland will not dare dispute.

Sir William Petty states, that before the insurrection there were 3,000 estated Roman Catholics in Ireland; and that, by judicial investigations in the court of claims, held in 1663, it appeared that there were not more than 400 of them* engaged in the glorious but unfortunate struggle for Irish liberty, which, even by the friends and partisans of the English revolution in 1688, the American in 1776, and the French in 1789, is so very erroneously and inconsistently styled a rebellion.† And let it be observed, that, notwithstanding the very small proportion of the estated Catholics who were implicated in the insurrection, we have established the fact, that every effort had been used by the lords justices to goad the whole nation into resistance, for the purpose of confiscating the ten millions of acres of the soil, which they and their friends in England had already devoured in imagination.

* "The number of landed Papists, or freeholders, before the wars, was about 3,000, *whereof*, as appears by 800 judgments of the court of claims, which sat anno 1663, upon the innocence and effects of the Irish, *there were not above one-seventh part, or 400, guilty of the rebellion.*"[491]

† See the reflections on this topic, supra, page 92.

[491] Petty, 23.

We shall now dismiss Temple, with a few concluding remarks. We have asserted that he was a cheat and an impostor. We proceed to the proof.

I. He who swears positively to that for which he has not the evidence of his senses; in other words, to what he has on the information of others; or to things contrary to the known laws of nature; is, in the most unqualified sense, an abandoned perjurer.

II. An historian who rests his narrative on manifest perjuries, is a cheat and an impostor, unworthy of credit.

III. The mass of the depositions on which Temple relies to support his history, are mere hearsay, and many of them contrary to the known and immutable laws of nature; and, consequently, the witnesses were a host of absolute perjurers.

IV. Therefore Temple was a cheat and an impostor. Q. E. D.

## CHAPTER XX.

*Barbarous system of warfare pursued by the Irish government. Indiscriminate murder and massacre of the Irish, men, women, and children. St. Leger, Monroe, Coote, Hamilton, Grenville, Ireton, and Cromwell, bathed in blood. Five days' butchery in Drogheda. Detestable hypocrisy of Cromwell. A medal and gold chain awarded to a noyadist. Extermination of man and beast, for twenty-eight miles!!!*

"Thou hypocrite! Cast out first the beam that is in thine own eye, and then thou shalt see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."[492]

WE have now thoroughly exposed the abominable legends, respecting the pretended Irish massacre, that have so long passed current with the world. They owe their origin to one of the most despicable of the scribblers who have surreptiously gained a rank among the honourable class of historians; but have been since unworthily bolstered up by names of the highest celebrity. We trust we have succeeded in demonstrating that the terrific story rests wholly

[492] Luke vi. 42.

on falsehood and perjury of the very grossest kind.

We proceed to examine the system of warfare pursued by the Irish government; and to ascertain with what propriety or justice it could complain of murder and massacre, had the insurgents been really guilty of the crimes alleged against them. We pledge ourselves to prove, that a more murderous system of warfare never prevailed, in any age or any country; that many of their commanders were as merciless and as bloodthirsty as Attila or Genghis Khan; and that some of the scenes of slaughter were so horrible, particularly, as will appear in the sequel, at Cashel, Drogheda, and Wexford, that they never were and never could be exceeded, and have been rarely equalled.

In the long catalogue of human follies, there is none more unaccountable, more ludicrous, or more universal, than that of censuring in others those vices and crimes to which we are ourselves most prone. Who has not heard elaborate declamations against intemperance, from drunkards; against lust, from debauchees; against meanness and avarice, from misers? There is not a nation in the world, that has not a variety of terse passages on this extraordinary propensity.

> "Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?
> Quis cœlum terris non misceat, et mare cœlo,
> Si fur displiceat Verri, homicida Miloni,

Clodius accuset mæchos, Catilina Cethegum;
In tabulam Syllæ si dicant discipuli tres?"*[493]

The era embraced in our discussions affords a most striking illustration of this view of human nature. While the

"Starry welkin has rung"

with the hoarse din of horrible massacres said to have been perpetrated by the Irish, it will appear, as clear as the noon-day sun, that the Irish rulers, in giving these statements, were drawing their own picture; and that the poet's

"Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur,"†

was never more appropriate than to those rulers and their agents.

The leading features of the warfare carried on by the forces of the Irish government, were,

I. The Irish, unarmed and wholly defenceless, were frequently massacred and drowned, without mercy. From this fate, neither priests, women, nor children, were exempted;

* "All must hear, the while,
The Gracchi rail at faction, with a smile.
Who would not swear, by ev'ry awful name,
If Milo murder, Verres theft should blame;
Clodius pursue adulterers to the bar,
Caius tax Catiline with civil war;
Or Sylla's pupils, aping ev'ry deed,
Against his tables of proscription plead."[494]

† "Change but the name, of thee the tale is told."[495]

[493] Juvenal, II. 25. [494] Gifford, 41. [495] Francis.

II. Men who had been overcome in battle; thrown down their arms; made no further resistance; and begged for quarter; were butchered by hundreds, and sometimes by thousands.

III. And, to crown all, after surrender made, and quarter promised, the faith pledged to the Irish was often perfidiously violated, and they were butchered in cold blood.

---

It was our intention to have classed the various facts, in support of these several allegations, exactly under their respective heads: but, as many of the instances of atrocity which we have collected, exemplify more than one of our positions; and as others, though of equal force, cannot properly be classed under any of them, we are not able to carry that plan fully into effect. We shall, however, adhere to it as closely as in our power. But we are convinced, that their effect on the reader's mind will depend, not on their classification, but on their magnitude, importance, and authenticity. If, weighed in the balance of truth, they be found wanting in these essential particulars, no accuracy of arrangement can save them from condemnation. But if they stand a scrutiny on those grand points, their deficiency in any of the minor ones will not be regarded as of material consequence.

In this investigation, we voluntarily subject ourselves to a disadvantage, of which we are

persuaded, the world has hitherto afforded no precedent. We had provided a large body of authentic testimony, from Clanrickarde, Castlehaven, Walsh, Curry, and other writers on the Irish side of the question, of which we proposed to avail ourselves. But, being determined to remove all possible ground for cavil, we have laid the whole aside; and shall rely solely on two species of authorities, which must overwhelm all opposition, and settle this question eternally. The first is, the despatches and documents of the sanguinary ruffians who perpetrated the murders; and the second, the statements of the Anglo-Hibernian historians.

We thus place ourselves in the predicament of a man who has a process at law, and has prepared ample documents to establish his claims; but, finding his antagonist's documents so strong and so powerful against their owner, as to render his own unnecessary, he throws them into the fire: and, so far as respects the contents of this chapter, one of the most important in our work, we care not if every page, written in defence of the Irish, were committed to the flames.

Should we, to use the legal phraseology, make out our case under these circumstances, as we trust we shall, it will afford the strongest proof that can be desired or conceived, of the intrinsic goodness of the cause, and of the extent of the delusion that has prevailed on the subject. We are well aware of the immense advantages we forego

by this course; but we forego them cheerfully, and have no more doubt of the result, than we have that the sun, which is now setting in the western horizon, will rise again, resplendent, in all its majesty and glory, to illumine a grateful and admiring world.

Those, however, who wish to peruse a list of the murders and massacres perpetrated on the Irish, as recorded by the writers of that nation, are referred to the Appendix to Clarendon's "History of the Irish Rebellion," where there is a large collection to be found, with due detail of time and place.

Resting wholly on plain matter of fact, we are unfortunately debarred of the rhetorical flourishes of "*lakes and rivers of blood*," "*spirits chaunting hymns*," "*ghosts rising from the rivers, and shrieking out revenge*," and all those other "*tales of horror*," and "*suggestions of frenzy*," which decorate the pages of the long train of historians, from Temple to Leland, who have exhausted the powers of eloquence in embellishing the legends of "*the execrable Irish rebellion.*" But we feel full confidence, that our

"Round unvarnish'd tale"

will "*put them down*," in the estimation of every upright and candid reader.

After these preliminary observations, we enter on the proof of the important positions we have laid down, respecting the system of warfare pur-

sued by the forces of the Irish government. The first branch of No. I. is,

"The Irish, unarmed and wholly defenceless, were frequently massacred and drowned, without mercy." Behold our proofs.

"Monroe advanced with his army into the county of Cavan, from whence he sent parties into Westmeath and Longford, which burnt the country, and *put to the sword all the country people they met*."[496]

"Sir Charles Coote, immediately after *his inhuman executions and promiscuous murders of people in Wicklow*, was made governor of Dublin."[497]

"As soon as Monroe had received an account of the cessation being concluded, *he fell upon the Irish peasants*, *who were getting in their harvest in great security*, *as no longer thinking of an enemy*, *and made a slaughter among them*."[498]

"*They put to the sword thirty Irish*, *taken by them in that vessel at Padstow*."[499]

"After a little dispute, the Parliament's ship boarded the Dunkirker, and *put all the Irish in her to the sword*, and took the rest prisoners."[500]

"The garrison was sent away under convoy: but, by the disorderliness of an unpaid soldiery, they were *almost all of them plundered and murdered*."[501]

"*They hanged above fifty of the Irish*, according to the lord general his orders."[502]

"Captain Barrow took O'Ronie's island, in Ireland, and *put eighty there to the sword*."[503]

Douglas "marched as through an enemy's country, his men plundering *and even murdering with impunity*."[504]

[496] Carte, I. 495. [497] Idem, 259. [498] Idem, 485.
[499] Whitelock, 202. [500] Idem, 204. [501] Warner, 271.
[502] Whitelock, 505. [503] Idem, 531, [504] Leland, IV. 307.

Lord Broghill, "on the 21st August, 1642, took the castle of Ardmore, in the county of Waterford, being yielded on discretion. The women and children were spared; *but the men, a hundred and forty in number, were put to the sword.*"[505]

"Sir Frederick Hamilton entered the town of Sligo, and burnt it, freed many Protestants, and *slew in the streets three hundred Irish.*"[506]

"Colonel Sydenham, major Sydenham, and other forces, hastened thither, put them to flight, and pursued them almost to Wareham, slew twelve, and took sixty horses and a hundred and sixty prisoners, whereof *eight being natural Irish, seven of them were immediately hanged*, and the other spared, for doing execution on his fellows."[507]

"St. Leger was informed of another robbery committed on the cattle of his brother-in-law, which he revenged in a very cruel and indiscriminate manner, *killing near twenty people, some of them entirely innocent:* and when one of his captains, *who had killed nine or ten inoffensive people*, destroyed their houses, and drove away their cattle, was complained of to him, instead of punishing, he seemed to approve those outrages."[508]

"*Some Walloons, whom the soldiers took for Irishmen, were put to the sword.*"[509]

"Inchiquin commits great destruction, as far as he dares venture, about Dublin and Tredah, by burning and driving away of their cattle, and *hangs all he can meet with, going to the lord lieutenant.*"[510]

"At the taking of Caermarthen, by captain Swanley, *many Irish rebels were thrown into the sea.*"[511]

The second branch of No. I. is,

"From this fate [of massacre] priests, women, and children, were not exempted."

Our last chapter contained the bloodthirsty orders of the lords justices and Privy Council, to

[505] Rushworth, V. 515. [506] Ibid. [507] Idem, 686.
[508] Warner, 155. [509] Whitelock, 332. [510] Idem, 410.
[511] Idem, 83.

murder "all the males able to bear arms, in places where the rebels were harboured." We now proceed to prove, that these barbarous orders were fully carried into operation.

Leland and Warner inform us, that, "in the execution of these orders, *the soldiers slew all persons promiscuously*."* They state this on the authority of the lords justices themselves, whose testimony must be regarded as indisputable.

But was not this the consequence the miscreants calculated on producing? Could they have reasonably expected any other? When the devouring sword is invited from its scabbard by public authority, for the indiscriminate slaughter of "*men able to bear arms*," will not the expiring and bed-rid wretch be despatched to the other world, as a man "able to bear arms?" Will his cassock protect the priest? her bonnet or shawl the pity-inspiring female? or its cradle and tender cries the helpless infant? No: he must be a mere novice in human nature and human affairs, who entertains a doubt on the subject.

"Monroe *put sixty men*, EIGHTEEN WOMEN, *and two priests to death*, in the Newry."[512]

"The lord president of Munster, St. Leger, is so cruel and merciless, that *he causes honest men and women to be most execrably executed*, and amongst the rest, *caused a woman great*

* "The soldiers, in executing their orders, *murdered all persons that came in their way promiscuously*, NOT SPARING THE WOMEN, AND SOMETIMES NOT THE CHILDREN."[513]

[512] Leland, III. 201. [513] Leland, III. 198. Warner, 194.

*with child to be ript up*, and three babes to be taken out of her womb, and then thrust every of the babes with weapons through their little bodies. This act of the lord president hath set many in a sort of desperation." Lord of Upper Ossory's Letter to the Earl of Ormond.[514]

"Sir Theophilus Jones had taken a castle, *put some men to the sword, and thirteen priests*, having with them two thousand pounds."[515]

"*Their friars and priests were knocked on the head promiscuously with the others, who were in arms.*"[516]

"Letters from Ireland, that the Lord Inchiquin relieved some garrisons of the English in Tipperary, entered Carricke and fortified a pass to make good his retreat, blew open the gate of Cullen by a petard, entered the town, took two castles by assault, and *put three hundred soldiers to the sword, and some women*, notwithstanding order to the contrary."[517]

"Sir William Parsons hath by late letters advised the governor to the burning of Corn, and *to put man, woman, and child to the sword;* and *Sir Adam Loftus hath written in the same strain.*"[518]

## Our second position is,

## II. "Men who had been overcome in battle; thrown down their arms; made no further resistance; and begged for quarter; were butchered by hundreds, and sometimes by thousands."

"A neighbouring bog tempted the Irish foot to retire thither for refuge, while their horse marched off with very little loss, and unmolested. The bog was too small to afford them protection. Jones surrounded it with his horse, whilst his foot entered it, and attacked the Irish, *who threw down their arms, and begged for quarter. Above three thousand of them were put to the sword.*"[519]

[514] Carte, III. 51.
[515] Whitelock, 502.
[516] Idem, 412.
[517] Idem, 296.
[518] Ormond, II. 350.
[519] Carte, II. 5.

"They defeated and pursued them with great slaughter, *ranting quarters to none but officers. About two thousand ell* by the weapons of an enemy transported by zeal and re-entment, *about five hundred plunged into lake Erne*, and *but ne of all the multitude escaped*."[520]

"*As no quarter was given*, except to colonel Richard Butler, on to the lord Ikerin (who was the last man of the Irish rmy that retired) *few prisoners were made*."[521]

"The left, commanded by Mac-Allisdrum, consisting of rave northern Irish, stood their ground; but were at last orced to yield to the conquerors; their commander giving up is sword to colonel Purden. But *lord Inchiquin having, before the battle, ordered that no quarter should be given to the nemy*, the brave Mac-Allisdrum and most of his men *were ut to the sword in cold blood*."[522]

"Lieutenant colonel Sanderson, at the same time, and Sir Francis Hamilton coming in the nick of time with his troop, *hey had al! execution upon them for five miles*."[523]

"Colonel Mathews, at Dromore, getting together a body of wo hundred men, attacked five hundred of the rebels; and, aving killed three hundred of them without the loss of a man, he next day he pursued the rest, *who had hid themselves about n the bushes, and, starting them like hares out of their formes, illed a hundred and fifty more*."[524]

"The lord Inchiquin took Pilborne castle by storm, and *out all in it but eight to the sword*."[525]

"His men had the pursuit of the rebels seven miles, three several ways, as long as the day lasted, and *in the flight and pursuit, were slain of the rebels about four thousand*."[526]

"*The rebels were pursued without mercy;* and, in their flight, spread a general consternation through all their adherents."[527]

[520] Leland, IV. 256. [521] Smith II. 142. [522] Idem, 162.
[523] Rushworth, VI. 239. [524] Warner, 113.
[525] Whitelock, 225. [526] Idem, 283.
[527] Leland, III. 201.

"In the battle, and *a bloody pursuit of three miles*, 7,000 of the Irish were slain. *The unrelenting fury of the victors appeared in the number of their prisoners, which amounted only to* 450."[528]

Our third position is,

III. "After surrender made, and quarter promised, the faith pledged to the Irish was perfidiously violated, and they were butchered in cold blood."*

"The army, I am sure, was not eight thousand effective men; and of them it is certain there were not above six hundred killed; *and the most of them that were killed were butchered after they had laid down their arms, and had been almost an hour prisoners, and divers of them murdered after they were brought within the works of Dublin.*"[529]

The bishop of Clogher "having detached colonel Swiney with a strong party, to make an attempt upon Castledoe, in the county Donegal, he ventured, contrary to the advice of the most experienced officers, with 3,000 men, to fight Sir Charles Coote, with near double his number, at Letterkenny. Major general O'Cahan, many of his principal officers, and fifteen hundred common soldiers, were killed on the spot; *and the colonels Henry Roe, and Phelim M'Tuol O'Neile, Hugh Macguire, Hugh Mac-Mahon, and others, slain after quarter given.*"[530]

We cannot allow ourselves to doubt, for a moment, that we have fully established our positions on the most impregnable ground. Limiting

* A most striking instance, in proof of this accusation, is afforded by the slaughter at Drogheda; of which an account will be found at the close of this chapter.

528 Leland, IV. 342.
529 Ormond, II. 396.
530 Carte, II. 113.

ourselves, as we have done, to the accounts of the perpetrators of the murders, and their historians, it is matter of astonishment, that we have been able to adduce such strong evidence. But it is a peculiar feature in this history, that the criminals narrate their crimes, with as little ceremony as if they claimed glory from them. A few circumstances, of peculiar atrocity, which add strong corroboration to the testimony, are reserved for the close of this chapter.

The pretences on which the Irish were slaughtered, were, in many instances, of the most frivoous and contemptible character: but it is a trite observation, that those who are wicked enough o perpetrate crimes, are never without a plea to ustify, or at least to palliate, their guilt. Sir S. Harcourt besieged a castle in the vicinity of Dubin, where, venturing too near, he was shot. The barbarian besiegers, when they took the castle, o revenge the death of their general, slaughtered every man, woman, and child it contained.*

* "Sir S. Harcourt was sent out with a small party, in orer to dislodge them. But being obliged to send back for some attering cannon, whilst he waited for these, and was giving is soldiers some orders, one of the rebels perceiving him, ischarged his piece at him, and gave him a mortal wound; f which he died the next day, to the prejudice of the service nd the great grief of the English. His men, who loved him reatly, were so enraged at the cowardly manner in which he as killed, that when the cannon came up, and had made a

57

Warner relates this atrocious act, not merely without censure, but with "apparent" justification, or at least extenuation. He says, "the soldiers were so enraged at the cowardly manner in which he was killed, that they put all within to the sword." This was probably the pretext the murderers assigned at the time, and which the doctor copied without reflection. It would appear that the reverend historian supposed there was some ceremony necessary to be observed by the garrison of a besieged castle, before they shot at their enemies. Perhaps he thought that they ought to have sent a herald to Harcourt, to warn him to beware of the bullet. This is sheer nonsense. Who would dare to censure for cowardice the man who shot general Wolfe or general Montgomery, at Quebec; general Mercer, at Princeton; general Ross, at Baltimore; or general Packenham, at New Orleans? In a word, lives there a man absurd enough to aver, that there is any cowardice in sending a whizzing bullet to salute a besieging enemy, who ventures within reach of a shot?

That "straws show which way the wind blows," is an adage of more sound sense than elegance. An occurrence which Ludlow narrates, with great naivete, affords a strong confirmation of the va-

breach sufficient for them to take the castle by storm, *they put all within to the sword, without sparing man, woman, or child.*"[531]

[531] Warner, 183.

ious proofs we have already adduced of the nurderous spirit by which the forces of the Irish government were actuated. It evinces, that no aging bloodhounds were ever more ravenous fter their prey, than they were for the slaughter of the devoted Irish.

A few wretched fugitives, who had escaped rom their enemies, had taken refuge in a cave, nd were discovered by Ludlow's army, on his narch. Thirsting for their lives, he spent nearly wo days in the effort to smother them by smoke; ut his endeavours failed of success. At length, ome of his soldiers forced their way into the ave, where they found about twenty defenceless vretches, whose forlorn state would have almost xcited the pity of a band of ruthless Creeks or Cherokees: but humanity or pity for the Irish ormed no part of the system then pursued. Fifeen of them were butchered in the cave; and our or five brought out alive, who probably hared a similar fate, although the writer is silent s to the issue.*

* "From hence I went to visit the garrison of Dundalk, and eing upon my return, I found a party of the enemy retired vithin a hollow rock, which was discovered by one of ours, vho saw five or six of them standing before a narrow passage t the mouth of the cave. The rock was so thick, that we hought it impossible to dig it down upon them, and therefore esolved to try to *reduce them by smoak*. After some of our nen had spent most part of the day in endeavouring *to smother those within*, *by fire placed at the mouth of the cave*, they vithdrew the fire; and the next morning, supposing the Irish

This single fact, narrated by the master butcher himself, would, if it stood alone, be sufficient to establish the infernal spirit with which the armies of the government were actuated. It is easy to conceive, that those whose thirst of blood induced them to arrest a considerable army in its march, and spend two days, in the hope of glutting their

to be made incapable of resistance by the smoak, some of them with a candle before them crawled into the rock. One of the enemy, who lay in the middle of the entrance, fired his pistol, and shot the first of our men in the head, by whose loss we found that the smoak had not taken the designed effect. But seeing no other way to reduce them, I caused the trial to be repeated, and upon examination found that though a great smoak went into the cavity of the rock, yet it came out again at other crevices; upon which *I ordered those places to be closely stopped, and another smother made.* About an hour and an half after this, one of them was heard to groan very strongly, and afterwards more weakly, whereby we presumed that the work was done; yet the fire was continued till about midnight, and then taken away, that the place might be cool enough for ours to enter the next morning. At which time some went in armed with back, breast, and head-piece, to prevent such another accident as fell out at their first attempt; but they had not gone above six yards before they found the man that had been heard to groan, who was the same that had killed one of our men with his pistol, and who, resolving not to quit his post, had been, upon stopping the holes of the rock, choaked by the smoak. Our soldiers put a rope about his neck and drew him out. The passage being cleared, they entered, and *having put about fifteen to the sword*, brought four or five out alive, with the priest's robes, a crucifix, chalice, and other furniture of that kind. Those within preserved themselves by laying their heads close to a water that ran through the rock."[532]

[532] Ludlow, I. 422.

rage with a few human victims who had sought security in a cavern, would flesh their swords indiscriminately in all they met in human form, male or female, old or young, bearing the hated Irish name. This very rational conclusion is fully established by the mass of revolting facts contained in the present chapter.

A circumstance which occurred in consequence of the murderous ordinance of the Long Parliament* to give no quarter to Irish prisoners, evinces such transcendent injustice and folly, that it deserves to be put on record, to display the temper of the times, and to prove that the slaughter of the Irish was regarded as perfectly innocent.

The army of the Parliament had taken a number of prisoners, among whom were thirteen Irishmen, who, in pursuance of the above ordinance, were immediately executed. Prince Rupert, bold, brave, and determined, took measures to ascertain the fact; and, as soon as all doubt of it was removed, singled out an equal number of prisoners belonging to the enemy, and, as right and justice required, in order to arrest the progress of this murderous system, retaliated on them the cruelty of which their officers had set such a terrible example.

It is incredible what an outcry this laudable, because necessary, measure of severity excited. Had the prince hanged these men in retaliation

* Supra, 380.

for the slaughter of an equal number of cats or dogs, his cruelty and injustice could not have been more severely execrated than it was by the Parliament, whose army was with difficulty prevented from butchering their English prisoners; as if they had not been themselves the original aggressors.* The carnage of the Irish, being sanctioned by the ordinance of Parliament, they regarded as lawful and innocent: but the retaliatory execution of their associates was, forsooth, abominable murder.

* "To the worthy and honoured William Lenthal, Esqr. Speaker of the Honourable House of Commons.

"Right Honourable,

"According to the ordinance of Parliament in that behalf, we caused some Irish rebels, to the number of thirteen, to be put to death; and since prince Rupert's coming into these parts, it happened that some of our men were taken by some of his commanders; and, as is verified to us, after quarter given them, were, by the prince's command, executed; which we hearing of, sent a trumpet to know the truth of the report, and the cause why they so suffered, by whom he returned us the letter inclosed for answer. The death of these soldiers being known in our several garrisons, hath so incensed the soldiery, that they vow revenge, and we found it difficult to prevent *their violent falling upon the prisoners in our custody;* whereof we thought good to certify this honourable house, and humbly pray your advice *how we shall prevent the acting the like cruelty upon our soldiers for the future.*

John Mackworth, Robert Olive,
Andrew Lloyd, Thomas Hart,
Samuel Moore, Leigh Owen.
Robert Charlton,

Salop, March 24, 1644."[533]

[533] Parliamentary History, XIII. 445.

Prince Rupert was made of too "stern stuff," :o be terrified out of his manly purpose. He announced his determination to pursue the sys- :em of *lex talionis*, and to murder man for man.* There do not appear any data whereon to ground an opinion of the ultimate issue of this sanguinary rivalry: but it is more than probable, that the energy and spirit of the prince stayed the pro- gress of the devouring sword, and rescued many an unfortunate Irishman from the horrible pro- scription of their enemies. Such a system, pur- sued steadily, as it ought to have been, by general Washington, would have snatched thousands of

* *Extracts from a letter of Prince Rupert to the Earl of Essex.*

"Those soldiers of mine, that were barbarously murdered n cold blood, after quarter given them at Shrewsbury, were uch as, during the time they were in Ireland, served his ma- esty stoutly, constantly, and faithfully, against the rebels of hat kingdom; and, after the cessation there, were, by his ma- esty's command, transported to serve him in this, where they ionestly performed the duty of soldiers."[534]

"If the same course shall be held, and any prisoners un- ler my command shall be taken, executed and murdered in old blood, under what senseless and unjust pretence whatso- ver; for every officer and soldier, so causelessly and barba- ously murdered, I will cause so many of the prisoners re- naining in my power to be put to death in the same manner: nd I do not in the least doubt but the blood of those misera- le men, who shall so suffer by my order, as well as those who hall be so butchered by that ordinance your lordship men- ions, shall be required at their hands, who by their cruel ex- mples impose a necessity upon other men to observe the rules hey lay down."[535]

[534] Parliamentary History, XIII. 455. [535] Idem, 457.

brave and noble victims from the horrors of the Jersey prison-ship. Any other system sacrifices our best friends for our worst enemies; than which a more miserable policy cannot be conceived.

A murderous ruffian, commander of one of the vessels belonging to the English Parliament, took a vessel with a number of Irish soldiers on board, who were not only not insurgents, but had served under the duke of Ormond against them, and, after the cessation of hostilities in Ireland, were going to England, to be incorporated in the royal army. In pursuance of the ordinance for giving no quarter to Irish prisoners, he tied seventy of them back to back, and threw them into the sea. For this cruel act, and other congenial exploits, the Parliament of England ordered him to be presented with a medal and a gold chain, of the value of two hundred pounds.*

Barbarous and murderous as were the commanders of the forces against the Irish, in general, there were some of them who far exceeded their colleagues in the dreadful trade of slaughter. Of these, St. Leger, Monroe, Inchiquin, Sir Richard

* "June 4, 1644. Ordered, That captain Swanly have the thanks of this house returned unto him for his faithful service and valiant actions, performed by him for the good of the publick, both at the Isle of Wight, Pembrokeshire and Caermarthenshire, and that a chain of gold of two hundred pounds price, with a medal annexed unto it, be bestowed upon him."[536]

[536] Journals, III. 517.

Grenville, Sir Charles Coote, Tichbourne, Ireton, and Cromwell, stand proudly pre-eminent, as prime ministers of Satan, in the horrid work of extermination.

Grenville was naturally ferocious and bloodthirsty: but his native ferocity was whetted by avarice and rapacity, which goaded him to deeds of horror, of the blackest die. He hung old and bed-ridden men, for not discovering wealth which they did not possess; and, with equal barbarity, hung women, frequently of quality, because they had not as much money as he had expected.* This barbarian, having been ordered to England, pursued the same system of rapine and murder there.†

* "Sir Richard Grenville, upon the fame of being a good officer, was sent over with a very good troop of horse; was major of the earl of Leicester's own regiment of horse, and was very much esteemed by him, and the more by the Parliament, for *the signal acts of cruelty he did every day commit upon the Irish;* which were of so many kinds upon both sexes, young and old, *hanging old men who were bed-rid*, because they would not discover where their money was, that he believed they had; *and old women*, some of quality, after he had plundered them, and found less than he expected; that they can hardly be believed, though notoriously known to be true."[537]

† "He made one of them hang all the rest; which, to save his own life, he was contented to do: *so strong his appetite to those executions he had been accustomed to in Ireland, without any kind of commission, or pretence of authority.*"[538]

[537] Clarendon, IV. 537. [538] Idem, 538.

A few of the characteristic feats of St. Leger,* Inchiquin, Monroe, and Coote, grace the foregoing pages. Honourable mention remains to be made of Tichbourne, Ireton, and Cromwell,—a bloody triumvirate, whose names ought to be held in eternal reprobation by Irishmen and descendants of Irishmen.

Henry Tichbourne, governor of Drogheda, signalized for his sanguinary career, merited the distinction we have accorded him, to be ranked with the destroyers, Ireton and Cromwell. In a familiar letter to his wife, as a matter of course, he communicates the information, that, finding he could not induce the Irish to hazard the fortune of a battle, he had concluded "they were in another sort to be dealt with;" and accordingly the wretch sallied out "*every other morning, for several weeks*," slaughtering all he met, without mercy; so that he left "*neither man nor beast alive*," for sixteen miles from the garrison.† And

* "If, in the execution of martial law, he [St. Leger] *spared neither sex nor age*, his countrymen frequently expressed *a generous indignation and horror at his barbarity*."[539]

† "Finding that they did only put themselves in arms, and would no more now than formerly forsake their strength, to draw into equality of ground, notwithstanding their advantage of numbers, I concluded they were in another sort to be dealt with; and from thenceforth, for the most part, I fell every other morning into their quarters, and continued those visitations for several weeks together, *with the slaughter of very many of them*, especially the new plantation in the county of

[539] Leland, III. 171.

one of his coadjutors in this business of destruction perpetrated the same havoc, for twelve miles on the other side: thus filling the country with carnage, for twenty-eight miles, and "not leaving man nor beast alive!" In another part of this letter, he informs her of one of his murderous expeditions, in which he says, "*he took no account of the slain; but there was little mercy shown in those times.*"[540] What a hideous picture of incarnate demons do these horrible facts present to the mind's eye! And what effrontery must not Temple and his followers have possessed, when they dared to raise such an outcry against the Irish, for the crimes which they themselves perpetrated!

Of all the cases of murderous cruelty that marked the career of the government forces in Ireland, the most atrocious occurred at the surrender of Drogheda. The history of the Huns, Vandals, Goths, and Ostrogoths, or of those scourges of the human race, the successors of Mahomet, may be searched in vain for any thing more shocking. In fact, it is not in the power of man, were he possessed by all the furies of the

Monaghan, and at the taking in of Harry O'Neal's house, in the Fews; insomuch that by this course, and the like acted often by the garrison at Drogheda, *there was neither man nor beast to be found in sixteen miles*, between the two towns of Drogheda and Dundalk, nor on the other side of Dundalk, in the county of Monaghan, nearer than Carrick Mac-Cross, a strong pile, *twelve miles distant.*"[541]

540 Tichbourne, 186.

541 Idem, 188.

heathen mythology, to exceed these frightful scenes. They may be equalled,—but can never be surpassed.

Cromwell had besieged this town for some time; and was finally admitted, on promise of quarter. The garrison consisted of the flower of the Irish army, and might have beaten him back, had they not been seduced by his solemn promise of mercy, which was observed till the whole had laid down their arms. Then the merciless wretch commanded his soldiers to begin a slaughter of the entire garrison, *which slaughter continued for five days!!* with every circumstance of brutal and sanguinary violence that the most cruel savages could conceive or perpetrate.*

> "No age was spar'd; no sex, nay no degree;
> Not infants in the porch of life were free.
> The sick, the old, who could but hope a day
> Longer by Nature's bounty, not let stay:
> Virgins and widows, matrons, pregnant wives,
> All died. 'Twas crime enough that they had lives."[542]

This canting and hypocritical impostor, in his despatches to the Parliament, had the shameless

* "The assault was given, and his [Cromwell's] men twice repulsed; but in the third attack, colonel Wall being unhappily killed at the head of his regiment, his men were so dismayed thereby, as to listen, before they had any need, to the enemy *offering them quarter*, admitting them upon those terms, and thereby betraying themselves and their fellow-soldiers to the slaughter. *All the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army promised quarter to such as would lay down their arms*, and

[542] Ben Jonson.

mpudence to ascribe "*the glory*" of this bloody leed to God, "to whom indeed the praise of *this nercy* belongs!!"* And such was the delusion

erformed it as long as any place held out; which encouraged thers to yield. But when they had once all in their power, and eared no hurt that could be done them, Cromwell, being told y Jones, that he had now all the flower of the Irish army in his ands, *gave orders that no quarter should be given;* so that his oldiers were forced, *many of them against their will, to kill heir prisoners.* The brave governor Sir A. Aston, Sir Edm. 'erney, the colonels Warren, Fleming and Byrne, were *killed 1 cold blood;* and indeed all the officers, except some few of east consideration, that escaped by miracle. The Marquis of Ormond, in his letters to the king and lord Byron, says, 'that *1 this occasion Cromwell exceeded himself and any thing he ad ever heard of, in breach of faith and bloody inhumanity; nd that the cruelties exercised there, for five days after the wn was taken, would make as many several pictures of inhu-anity, as are to be found in the book of martyrs, or in the re-tion of Amboyna.*'"[543]

* "Sir,--It has pleased God to bless our endeavours at Drog-eda; after battering, we stormed it. The enemy were about ree thousand strong in the town. They made a stout re-stance, and near one thousand of our men being entered, the nemy forced them out again. *But God giving a new courage our men*, they attempted again, and entered, beating the nemy from their defences. The enemy had made three re-enchments, both to the right and left, where we entered, all hich they were forced to quit: being thus entered, *we refu-ed them quarter*, having the day before summoned the town. believe *we put to the sword the whole number of the defend-nts.* I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with heir lives: those that did are in safe custody, *for the Barba-oes.* Since that time the enemy quitted to us Trim and Dun-alk; in Trim they were in such haste, that they left their uns behind them. *This hath been a marvellous great mercy!!*

[543] Carte, II. 84.

of those times, that, in all the churches in London, thanks were returned to the God of mercy, for this barbarous slaughter of his creatures!*

History furnishes no circumstance more disgusting, revolting, or hideous, than this nauseous compound of base perfidy, murderous cruelty, and abominable hypocrisy. Never was the throne of the Living God more egregiously insulted, than by these impious offerings of thanksgiving; and never were the thunders of heaven more loudly called for, than to blast the Pharisaical wretches who made such a mockery of all the calls and duties of humanity and religion.

The enemy being not willing to put an issue upon a field battle, had put into this garrison almost all their prime soldiers, being about three thousand horse and foot, under the command of their best officers, Sir Arthur Ashton being made governour. They were some seven or eight regiments, Ormond's being one, under the command of Sir Edmund Verney. I do not believe, neither do I hear, that *any officer escaped with his life, save only one lieutenant*, who, I hear, going to the enemy, said, that he was the only man that escaped of all the garrison. The enemy were filled upon this with much terror: and truly I believe this bitterness will save much effusion of blood, *through the goodness of God!!!*

"I wish that all honest hearts may *give the glory of this to God alone, to whom indeed the praise of this mercy belongs*, for instruments they were very inconsiderable, the work throughout. O. Cromwell."[544]

* "The ministers of London acquainted the people with the great success of the Parliament's forces in Ireland, and returned thanks to God for the same."[545]

[544] Whitelock, 412. [545] Ibid.

Some time afterwards, Cromwell gained pos-
ession of Wexford, by treachery; where a car-
age was perpetrated, not far inferior to that
hich had taken place at Drogheda.*

There is an important passage in the preface
r introduction to Nalson's Collections, which we
xtracted, and intended to quote, but have mis-
id. We are therefore obliged to refer to it
om memory; as the work has been returned to
e New York library, whence it was procured,
d there is no copy in this city. The reverend
thor states, that one of those Herodists, worthy
isciples of the Idumean, whose deeds are re-
orded by St. Matthew, having been engaged in
e humane employment of slaughtering children,
efended the practice, by saying that "*nits would
e lice.*" This was an attempt to carry completely
to operation the horrible plan of extirpating the
hole race; the deliberate adoption of which we
ave proved, in a preceding part of this work,
d which was for some time acted upon by the
ling powers. For the accomplishment of this
rand object, the slaughter of the "*lice*," that is,
e full-grown men and women, was not deemed

* "As soon as Cromwell had ordered his batteries to play on
distant quarter of the town, [Wexford] Strafford admitted
s men into the castle, from whence issuing suddenly, and at-
cking the wall and gate adjoining, they were admitted, either
rough the treachery of the townsmen or the cowardice of the
ldiers, or perhaps both: *and the slaughter was almost as
eat as at Drogheda.*"[546]

[546] Warner, 476.

sufficient: the destruction of the "*nits*," or children, was necessary, to complete the magnificent scheme of a new plantation of the kingdom!

Ireton, apparently sated with slaughter, gave protection to the remnant of the inhabitants of a certain barony. But "*being informed* that they had broken the articles," he, without inquiry, issued orders to slaughter every "*man, woman, and child*" it contained.* Lord Broghill, though a sanguinary man, shuddered at the barbarity of these terrible orders; remonstrated with Ireton; and at length, with considerable difficulty, prevailed on him to confine the massacre to persons found in arms, or who made resistance.† Those who consider the awe which a ferocious army inspires, the reluctance which, without the most grievous outrage, the peasantry must have felt to encounter the swords of a victorious enemy, as well as the violence and rapacity of such

* "Soon after Ireton had the command of the army, he was informed that a certain barony had broken the articles in consideration of which they had been protected. He marched therefore against this barony, *and gave immediate orders to his soldiers to kill man, woman, and child:* but before these orders were executed, lord Broghill expostulated with him upon the cruelty of such proceedings."[547]

† "He was therefore humbly of opinion, that it would be more just, reasonable, and honourable, to order the soldiers to kill none but who were found in arms or made any opposition. With these words, *Ireton was at last, though hardly, persuaded to revoke his bloody commands*."[548]

[547] Orrery, I. 32. [548] Idem, 33.

n enemy, will be led to believe, that the provo-
ation was of a similar character with that which,
ccording to Phædrus, was given by the lamb,
rinking at the lower part of the stream, to the
olf, who was allaying his thirst above, and who
harged the innocent animal with muddying the
aters. The strong probability is, that some
ndividual resisted the rape of his wife or daugh-
er, or the plunder of his property, and that the
oiled ruffians magnified the affair into a viola-
on of the protection. But be that as it may, it
oes not diminish our horror of the merciless
reton, who issued the murderous mandate to
aughter "man, woman, and child;" as it must
e obvious, that, if there were really a violation
f the articles, a large portion of the men were
robably wholly innocent: and, at all events, the
omen, and more especially the children, could
ot have deserved the extermination from which
ney were so hardly rescued.

To the wretched Irish, neither caves, nor cas-
es, nor churches, afforded any security. The
urderous spirit of their enemies pursued them
every quarter, with as little mercy as the tiger
isplays towards the bleating lamb.

Three thousand men, women, and children, of
l ranks and ages, took refuge in the cathedral
f Cashel, hoping the temple of the Living God
ould afford them a sanctuary from the butche-
es that were laying the whole country desolate.
he barbarian Ireton forced the gates of the

church, and let loose his blood-hounds among them, who soon convinced them how vain was their reliance on the temple or the altar of God. They were slaughtered, without discrimination.* Neither rank, dignity, nor character, saved the nobleman, the bishop, or the priest; nor decrepitude, nor his hoary head, the venerable sage, bending down into the grave; nor her charms, the virgin; nor her virtues, the respectable matron; nor its helplessness, the smiling infant. Butchery was the order of the day,—and all shared the common fate.

" Behold the furious and unpitying soldier,
Pulling his reeking dagger from the bosoms
Of gasping wretches. Death in ev'ry quarter,
With all that sad disorder can produce,
To make a spectacle of horror.
" Distracted mothers
Kneeling before their feet, and begging pity;
Their naked, mangled breasts besmeared with blood,
And ev'n the milk, with which their fondled babes
Softly they hush'd, drop in anguish from them."[549]

That the leaders of the forces of the government perpetrated the most atrocious cruelties, we have fully proved. We shall now give a few strong facts, to satisfy the reader, that they gloried in their guilt, and regarded the extent of

* " Having brought together an army, he marched into the county of Tipperary, and hearing that many priests and gentry about Cashel had retired with their goods into the church, he stormed it, and being entered, *put three thousand of them to the sword, taking the priests even from under the altar.*"[550]

[549] Otway. [550] Ludlow, I. 106.

ieir murders as constituting their merits. The inguinary lord Orrery, bending down into the rave, being seventy-six years of age, in urging ie claims of the earl of Barrymore and his two ons on the speaker of the English House of ommons, appears to lay his chief dependence r success on the desolation they had perpetrated. he first, he says, lately hung up "forty-three otable rebels for a breakfast."* It is not difficult conceive what hideous havoc and carnage the instant repetition of these breakfasts, and of nners and suppers of the same character, must ave produced.

The merit of the two sons of lord Orrery far anscended that of lord Barrymore; as they, in ie course of a few months, destroyed above ree thousand of the Irish.† This afforded them sure claim to the favour and protection of go- ernment.

* "The earl of Barrymore "hath nothing but what he fight- with the rebels for, and getteth by his sword; *he having ely hanged forty-three notable rebels for a breakfast.*"[551]

† "I do affirm, and will make good this undeniable truth, t my two sons, Kynalmeaky and Broghill, with those forces t I have raised and satisfied, and they command, have been destruction of *above three thousand rebels, since the begin- ig of the insurrection.*"[552] This letter is dated August 25, 42; and the insurrection had not spread into Munster until cember, 1641. This affords a clew towards forming an imate of the horrible carnage perpetrated throughout the gdom on the wretched Irish.

551 Orrery, I. 12. 552 Idem, 15.

Sir William Cole, with one regiment of foot, of five hundred men, and one troop of horse, is recorded by Borlase to have slain 2,417 swordsmen, in various skirmishes and battles, and to have "*starved and famished of the vulgar sort*," whose property they had previously plundered, no less than "7,000 *persons*;"[553] and thus, adds he "the English in all parts fought, so as indeed the rebels lost, in the general, many men, and much of their substance." That they lost "much of their substance," and that their enemies were as justly celebrated for their skill in plunder as for their thirst of blood, is beyond doubt. The following circumstance will shed additional light on this subject.

Sir Richard Cox, in the subsequent war between James II. and William, boasted that he had, *in the single county of Cork, killed and hanged three thousand of the Irish*;* made preys to the amount of twelve thousand pounds; and divided

* "As for the enemy, I used them like nettles, and squeezed them (I mean their vagabond partyes) soe hard, that they could seldom sting; having, as I believe, *killed and hanged not less than three thousand of them*, whilst I stayed in the county of Cork; and taken from them, in cattle and plunder, at least to the value of 12,000*l.* which you will easily believe, when you know that I divided 380*l.* *between one troop* (colonel Townsend's) in the beginning of August. After which colonel Beecher and the western gentlemen got *a prey worth* 3,000*l.* besides several other lesser preys, taken by small partyes, that are not taken notice of."[554]

[553] Borlace, 87. [554] Sydney Papers M. I. 168.

three hundred and eighty pounds among one troop. This, it is to be presumed, is a pretty fair specimen of the slaughter and rapine that extended throughout the kingdom.

When a view is taken of the various thousands which we have gleaned up in the preceding pages; 3,000 in one place; 7,000 in another; 4,000 in another; 3,000 in another, and so on in succession; and when regard is had to the novel circumstance of our utterly excluding all the histories on the Irish side of the question, no man can doubt, that in this war of extermination, originally founded on the manifest perjury of O'Conally, provoked by the most savage cruelty, and protracted by the combined influence of devouring avarice, religious bigotry, and the most rancorous national hostility, there were, as we have already stated, from Sir William Petty, above **FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND OF THE IRISH** "wasted by the sword, plague, famine, hardship, and banishment, between the 23d October, 1641, and the same day, 1652;"[555] that Ireland, during that war, exhibited as dreadful a scene of rapine and slaughter as either Mexico or Peru, when invaded by the Spaniards; and that none of the sanguinary exploits of Cortes or Pizarro could exceed, for atrocity, the deeds of Coote, St. Leger, Monroe, Inchiquin, Grenville, Hamilton, Tichbourne, Ireton, and Cromwell.

[555] Petty, 18. Sir William states the precise number of 504,000.

The horrible scenes we have depicted were not confined to Ireland. The war was carried on, in England and Scotland, with similar rapine, desolation, and carnage on both sides, royalist and republican. It is not necessary, nor would it be proper, to enter here into detail respecting the affairs of the sister island. A few instances will be sufficient for our present purpose, merely to display the spirit of the age, the humanity of its warfare, and the peculiar propriety of the eternal reproaches, with which "the welkin has rung," against the barbarity of the Irish.

Lord Clarendon, in various parts of his history, narrates the ruthless ferocity that reigned in battle and after defeat, when neither age nor sex was spared. In particular, he states, that, in the pursuit of the royalists, after the battle of Edgehill, there were about one hundred women slaughtered, and among them the wives of some of the officers.*

According to Burnet, prisoners were slaughtered in cold blood, and after quarter given; and the preachers, from the pulpit, deprecated the extension of mercy towards them, and denounced all those who were for moderate measures.†

* "The enemy left no manner of cruelty unexercised that day; and in the pursuit *killed about one hundred women, whereof some were the wives of officers of quality.*"[556]

† "Upon this occasion, many prisoners that had quarter given them, *were murdered in cold blood.* The preachers thunder-

[556] Clarendon, IV. 639.

We conclude with an account, from Rushworth, of the ruthless and savage progress of Montross, in Scotland, anno 1644, which may stand a parallel with the murderous exploits of Ireton or Cromwell. For six weeks, he acted the part of a demon incarnate, as far as his power extended, *laying the whole country in flames*, and, in imitation of the sanguinary orders of the lords justices of Ireland, slaughtering all the males able to carry arms, or, in other words, "*fit for war*."*

---

The unceasing efforts that have been employed to stifle the truth, and to keep the world in a state of darkness, on the subject of the barbarous carnage perpetrated on the Irish, are incredible. They have unfortunately been but too successful.

d in their pulpits against all that were for moderate proceedings, as guilty of the blood that had been shed. '*Thine eye shall not pity, and thou shalt not spare*,' were often inculcated after every execution."[557]

* "Montross dividing his army into three brigades, ranged over the whole country, and laid it waste; *as many as they find in arms, going to the rendezvous, they slay, and spared no man fit for war;* and so destroyed, or drove out of the country, or into holes unknown, all the service, and *fired the villages and cottages*, and drove away and destroyed all their cattle. These things lasted from the 13*th of December* 1644, *to the end of January following*."[558]

557 Burnet, I. 40. 558 Rushworth, V. 931.

One instance displays such profligacy, that it only requires to be stated, to excite the indignation of every honourable mind.

The government forces in Ulster had committed some frightful massacres on the Irish, of which an account was published in London. The House of Commons, which was actuated by the most rancorous spirit of hostility towards the Irish, took the alarm. They had the printers committed to prison, without trial; ordered the book to be burned by the hands of the common hangman; and directed the Stationers' Company to seize all the copies that could be found, which were to be committed to the flames.* Thus early began the work of deception; thus early was the veil thrown over the enormities of which the Irish were the victims; and thus early were the streams of history poisoned by public authority.

* "June 8, 1642. Ordered, That the book, intituled 'A True Relation of the Proceedings of the Scots and English Forces in the North of Ireland,' *shall be burnt by the hands of the common hangman*, in the New Palace yard, at Westminster: and the master and wardens of the Company of Stationers are required to seize all such of these books as are any where to be had, that they may be burnt accordingly.

"Resolved, That Robert White *shall be forthwith committed prisoner to the King's Bench prison*, for printing and publishing of a scandalous libel, to the dishonour of the Scots nation; and he be referred to the King's Bench, to be proceeded with there according to law."[559]

[559] Journals, II. 619.

The following extract from a most virulent ook, published in London, anno 1647, affords full display of the infernal spirit of rancour and ıalice that then prevailed in England against the rish; and will serve, in some measure, to account or the butcheries of the St. Legers, the Monroes, ıe Cootes, the Iretons, and the Cromwells, as xhibited in the present chapter. It is quoted ı the North American Review, Vol. I. p. 305.

*The Simple Cobler of Aggavvam in America. Willing to help 'mend his Native Country, lamentably tattered, both in the upper-Leather and sole, with all the honest stitches he can take. And as willing never to bee paid for his work, by Old English wonted pay. It is his Trade to patch all the year long, gratis. Therefore I pray Gentlemen keep your purses. By Theodore de la Guard.* In rebus arduis ac tenui spe, fortissima quæque consilia tutissima sunt.—*Cic. In English,*

*When bootes and shoes are torne up to the lefts,*
*Coblers must thrust their awles up to the hefts.*

*This no time to feare* Apelles gramm:
Ne Sutor quidem ultra crepidam.

*ndon, printed by J. D. & R. I. for Stephen Bowtell, at the sign of the Bible in Popes Head-Alley,* 1647.

*Word of Ireland: Not of the Nation universally, nor of any man in it, that hath so much as one haire of Christianity or Humanity growing on his head or beard, but onely of the truculent Cut-throats, and such as shall take up Armes in their Defence.*

'These *Irish*, anciently called *Anthropophagi*, man-eaters: ve a Tradition among them, That when the Devill shewed Saviour all the kingdomes of the Earth and their glory, t he would not show him *Ireland*, but reserved it for him-: it is probably true, for he hath kept it ever since for his n peculiar; the old Fox foresaw that it would eclipse the

glory of all the rest: he thought it wisdome to keep it for a Boggards for himself, and all his unclean spirits imployed in this Hemisphere, and the people, to doe his Son and Heire, I mean the Pope, that service for which *Lewis* the eleventh kept his Barber *Oliver*, which makes them so blood-thirsty. They are the very Offall of men, Dregges of Mankind, Reproache of Christendome, the Bots that crawle on the Beasts taile. J wonder *Róme* it self is not ashamed of them.

"J begge upon my hands and knees, that the Expedition against them may be undertaken while the hearts and hands of our Souldiery are hot, to whom J will be bold to say briefly: Happy is he that shall reward them as they have served us: and Cursed be he that shall doe that work of the Lord negligently! *Cursed be he that holdeth back his Sword from blood!!!* yea, *Cursed be he that maketh not his Sword starke drunk with Irish blood!!!* that doth not recompence them double for their hellish treachery to the English! *that maketh them not heaps upon heaps!! and their country a dwelling place for Dragons, an Astonishment to Nations!* Let not that eye look for pity, nor that hand to be spared, that pities or spares them! and *let him be accursed, that curseth them not bitterly!!!!*"

This work was received with such approbation, that it passed through several editions. When such Luciferian doctrines were fulminated, coolly and deliberately, from the press, it is not wonderful that they were carried into ferocious and sanguinary practice, in the field of battle; and that "*the nits*" and "*the lice*" were slaughtered in one common mass.

## CHAPTER XXI.

*leans by which subjugated countries are held in chains. Protestant ascendency. Code of demoralization, tyranny, oppression, rapine, and murder. Robbery of father, mother, sister, and brother, invited by acts of Parliament. Prohibition of education. Horse thieves excited and protected by law.*

IN every subjugated country, there is always a nall body of the natives, who make a regular ontract, not written, but well understood, and uly carried into effect, by which they sell the ation to its oppressors, and themselves as slaves, or the sorry privilege of tyrannizing over their llow slaves. This has ever been the surest oundation on which the dominion of one couny over another is perpetuated. The base and iserable oligarchs who subserve the interests of ie ruling nation, indemnify themselves for the hains which they drag about, by the superior eight and pressure of those they impose.

When the English Henrys overran and subdued 'rance; had the crown placed on their heads, in 'aris; and enjoyed a flattering prospect of peranently securing its descent to their posterity,

it was not by any means through the force of English skill or English valour, though both were of the highest grade at that period, that they achieved the conquest. They had at all times in their armies hosts of traitorous Frenchmen, who paved the way for the conquest and slavery of their country. Such, too, was the Roman policy, —such the means whereby that all-grasping and devastating government extended its empire over the then known world.

But the case of Ireland is probably among the most forcible illustrations of this maxim that history affords. A herd of wretched oligarchs have for centuries existed there, who have bartered their country's dearest rights and interests, for the privilege of trampling down their countrymen, over whom they have exercised the most galling tyranny that the mind of man can conceive.

Whenever an attempt has been made to shake off the yoke of foreign power, to emancipate the nation, this oligarchy has always had its spies, and pimps, and informers, among the friends of their country, by whose agency the attempt was baffled, and the patriots betrayed to the gallows.

> "Oh for a tongue to curse the slave,
> Whose treason, like a deadly blight,
> Comes o'er the councils of the brave,
> And blasts them in their hour of might!
> May life's unblessed cup for him
> Be drugg'd with treacheries to the brim,
> With hopes, that but allure to fly,
> With joys, that vanish while he sips,

Like Dead-Sea fruits, that tempt the eye,
But turn to ashes on the lips!
His country's curse, his children's shame,
Outcast of virtue, peace, and fame,
May he, at last, with lips of flame,
On the parch'd desert thirsting die,—
While lakes, that shone in mockery nigh,
Are fading off, untouch'd, untasted,
Like the once glorious hopes he blasted!
And, when from earth his spirit flies,
Just Prophet, let the damned one dwell
Full in the sight of Paradise,
Beholding heaven, and feeling hell!"[560]

This oligarchy now styles itself, as we have more than once stated, "the Protestant ascendency;" and is composed of the professors of the established religion. Its oppression has always extended over the Protestant dissenters, as well as over the Roman Catholics; but with very great disparity of effect. The principal grievance of the Protestant dissenter, which he bears in common with the Catholic, is, that he is obliged to support the ministers of two different religions,—his own and the dominant one. In other respects, he stands on nearly the same ground as the professor of the established religion.

The tyranny exercised by this oligarchy over the Catholics, has displayed itself in the form of a barbarous code of laws, the professed object of which was "to prevent the growth of Popery;" but the real one, to plunder those on whom they were to operate, of their property, and to divest

[560] Lalla Rookh.

them of their most sacred rights and privileges; and the direct effect of which was to demoralize the nation; to reduce it to a state of the most deplorable wretchedness and misery, not exceeded throughout the wide world; and to legalize an odious system of rapine and fraud.

> "Just Alla! what must be thy look,
> When such a wretch before thee stands
> Unblushing, with thy Sacred Book,
> Turning the leaves with blood-stained hands,
> And wresting from its page sublime
> His creed of lust and hate and crime!
> Ev'n as those bees of Trebizond,
> Which from the sunniest flowers that glad
> With their pure smile the gardens round,
> Draw venom forth that drives men mad!"[561]

This odious and oppressive system was about a century in maturing. Hardly a session of the Irish Parliament took place, in which there was not devised some new penalty, some new forfeiture, or some new disqualification, to crush, to prey on, and to immolate the wretched Roman Catholics. The utmost ingenuity of fraud and rapine was constantly tortured, to add to the weight of their clanking chains.

The most odious and wicked provisions of this code have been repealed; and an opinion too generally prevails, that it is nearly annihilated. This is a most egregious error. There are numberless harassing and vexatious disqualifications and incapacities still in full force. There is a

[561] Lalla Rookh.

nost valuable volume now before us, of above hree hundred and fifty pages, which contains a letail of those disqualifications, and is wholly onfined to that subject. It was our intention to ave given a sketch of them; but our limits forid the fulfilment of this purpose.

Various causes conspired to produce the salutary ffect of mitigating the severity of this vile code. The first stroke it received arose from the spirit f volunteering in Ireland, which was the conequence of the declared inability of the British overnment to protect that country, during the var against the United States, France, Spain, and Holland. Every description of religionists mixed n the ranks of the volunteers, which gave rise to n enlarged and liberal spirit of national feeling. The Irish Catholic and the Irish Protestant, as well s the Protestant dissenter, were amalgamated nto one common mass of friends to their comnon country. Many links of the chains of the ation at large, as well as of the proscribed Caholics, were then knocked off. The increasing iberality of the age has successively removed thers. But it is disgraceful and dishonourable, hat much remains yet to be done.

It may be thought a work of supererogation, at his time, to revive the remembrance of a code so dious, so detestable, and so infamous. But this vork would be very incomplete, and the reader vould have a very imperfect idea of the state of Ireland, and the horrible tyranny under which

the mass of the population has groaned, did we not give some sketch of this system.

Hundreds of thousands of pages have been written and printed, in discussing the question, Who and what is Antichrist, the beast with seven heads and ten horns? Various solutions have been given to the world. We are not very learned in this kind of lore; but flatter ourselves that we have made the discovery, which we freely communicate:—we are convinced that *religious persecution is the real and genuine Antichrist.* There is nothing of the wickedness of man so opposite to the spirit displayed in the words and actions of Jesus Christ.

Antichrist obtained a glorious triumph over the spirit of Jesus, when the Inquisition was established at Madrid, at Lisbon, at Goa, and elsewhere: and his reign has been coeval with the existence of those execrable tribunals. He reigned at Paris, in full splendour, at the massacre of St. Bartholomew's; in England, under the reign of Mary; and he has reigned throughout all Christendom, from the commencement of the Christian era, in the persecutions, more or less severe, of the unfortunate Jews.*

* It is inexpressibly painful to state, that an attempt to meliorate the condition of the Jews, has, to the disgrace and opprobrium of our common country, and of the age, recently failed, in the state of Maryland!! So powerful is inveterate prejudice, so slow the progress of illumination, and so much easier is it to rivet chains than to knock them off!

Nothing, however, but gross ignorance and igotry, can suppose that the reign of the Antihrist of persecution has been confined to Madrid, isbon, Goa, Paris, or the other places usually llotted to him. The most superficial glance at istory must evince the egregious folly of such n opinion. Antichrist reigned in Geneva, when 'alvin sanctioned the death of Servetus; in Lonon, when Henry VIII. and Elizabeth erected neir gibbets, to immolate those opposed to their pinions; in Scotland, when the Covenanters vere shot down in the fields; in Holland, when ne Remonstrants were plundered, and banished, nd immolated, for their dissent from the estalished creed; in Boston, when the Quakers vere persecuted and hanged; and he exercised most rigorous sway in Ireland, for above a centiry, during the operation of the barbarous code to prevent the growth of Popery."

We stand pledged to trace, at a future day, the rogress of Antichrist in various parts of Christendom.* At present, the nature of this work onfines us to his proceedings in Ireland.

We assume this position as undeniable:—

*Every man has a sacred and indefeasible right o worship God according to his judgment*, proided such worship do not tend to any breach of he fundamental laws of morality. Corollaries rom this maxim are,—

* In the Religious Olive Branch.

I. Every disqualification, on account of religious opinions or worship, is tyranny and oppression;

II. Every pecuniary penalty is robbery; and

III. Every capital punishment is murder.

Let us, by these principles, test the code in question; and we shall be satisfied that it was one unvarying tissue of oppression, robbery, and murder. It awarded capital punishments, as will appear by the subsequent detail, against about twenty different acts, all of them innocent, and many absolutely meritorious. The strength of the term, murder, may startle some readers: but we hold the position self-evident,—that those who suffer death, for acts not only not immoral or unjust, but absolutely laudable, are murdered, though their execution be sanctioned by all the legislatures and all the pretended courts of justice in the world.

All Roman Catholic archbishops, bishops, vicars general, deans, or any other persons of that religion, exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were liable to imprisonment and transportation; and, in case of returning, *were guilty of high treason, and were to be punished accordingly.**

* "All Popish archbishops, bishops, vicars general, deans, Jesuits, monks, friars, and *all other regular Popish clergy*, and all Papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall depart this kingdom before the 1st of May, 1698. And if any of them shall be, at any time after the said day, in this king-

In the year 1704, a law was passed, ordering ıll the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland to regis- :er themselves in the parishes to which they ·espectively belonged; and to give security for heir good behaviour, and for their non-removal rom the county where they then resided.*

When a priest officiated in any other parish han the one wherein he was registered, he was iable to transportation; and, in case of return, *o be hanged without benefit of clergy.*†

om, *they shall be imprisoned and remain there without bail till hey be transported* beyond the seas, out of the king's domi- ion, wherever the king, his heirs or successors, or chief go- ernors of this kingdom shall think fit; and *if any so trans- orted shall return again into this kingdom, then to be guilty f high treason, and to suffer accordingly*."[562]

* "Every Popish priest, who is now in this kingdom, shall, t the next Quarter Sessions, to be held in the several counties, r counties of cities or towns, next after the feast of St. John ıe Baptist, 1704, return his name and place he resides, toge- ıer with his age, the parish of which he pretends to be Popish riest, the time and place of his receiving Popish orders, and rom whom; and shall then enter into recognizance, with two ufficient sureties, each of the penalty of fifty pounds, to be of eaceable behaviour, and *not remove out of such county* where ıis abode is, into any other part of this kingdom."[563]

† "No Popish priest shall exercise the function or office of Popish priest, but in the parish where the said Popish priest ıid officiate at the time of registering the Popish clergy, and or which parish also he was registered, and in no other parish vhatsoever, *under the penalties as any Popish regular convict s liable unto*."[564]

[562] Robins, 451. [563] Idem, 458. [564] Idem, 464.

Every Roman Catholic clergyman in the kingdom not registered;* every one afterwards coming into it from abroad;† every one who kept a curate or assistant;‡ and every such curate or assistant,§ was also liable to transportation, and eventually *to the gallows, if he returned.*

Two justices might summon any Roman Catholic, sixteen years old, to appear before them, to give testimony when and where he heard mass; who were present, and who celebrated it; and all such other matters and things, touching the priest, as might be necessary to his conviction. In case of refusal, he was subject to a fine of twenty pounds, or imprisonment for one year.[565]

* "Every person whatsoever, exercising the office or function of a Popish priest, found in this kingdom, after the 24th of June, 1705, other than such as are registered pursuant to the above act, *shall be liable to such penalties, forfeitures, and punishments, as are imposed on Popish archbishops, bishops, &c.*[566]

† "Every Popish clergyman coming into this kingdom after the 1st of January, 1703, shall be liable to such penalties, forfeitures and punishments as are imposed on Popish archbishops and bishops."[567]

‡ "Every Popish parish priest, that shall keep any Popish curate, assistant, or coadjutor, shall lose the benefit of having been registered, *and shall incur all the penalties of a Popish regular, and shall be prosecuted as such;* § and every such Popish curate, assistant, or coadjutor *shall be deemed as a Popish regular, and prosecuted as such.*"[568]

565 Robins, 462.
566 Idem, 459.
567 Idem, 453.
568 Idem, 462.

Any Roman Catholic priest, celebrating marriage between two Protestants, or between a Protestant and Roman Catholic, was guilty of felony,* and liable to suffer death without benefit of clergy!†

No Roman Catholic was allowed to have in his own possession, or the possession of any other person for his use, any horse, mare, or gelding, of the value of five pounds.‡ Any Protestant,

* "If any Popish priest, or reputed Popish priest, or any erson pretending to be a Popish priest, or any degraded clergyman, or any layman pretending to be a clergyman of the hurch of Ireland, as by law established, shall, after the 25th lay of April, 1726, *celebrate any marriage between two Proestants, or reputed Protestants, or between a Protestant or eputed Protestant and a Papist*, such Popish priest, &c. *shall e guilty of felony, and shall suffer death as a felon, without enefit of clergy, or of the statute!!!*"[569]

† The writer of this recollects an instance, in his youth, of he execution of a Catholic clergyman, under this execrable tatute.

‡ "No Papist, after the 20th of January, 1695, shall be capale to have, or keep in his possession, or in the possession of ny other, to his use, or at his disposition, *any horse, gelding, r mare, of the value of 5l. or more;* and if any person of the Protestant religion, shall make discovery thereof upon oath, to ny two justices of the peace, or to the chief magistrate of any ity or town corporate, they may within their respective limits, y warrant under their hands and seals, authorize such peron, in the day-time only, to search for and secure all such orses: and *in case of resistance, to break open any door, and ring such horse or horses before them*, and such discoverer, being of the Protestant religion,) paying or making tender,

[569] Robins, 389.

discovering to any two justices that a Roman Catholic had a horse of that value, might, with a constable and assistant, break open any door; seize such horse; bring him before the justices; and, on paying five pounds five shillings, have the property of such horse, "as if bought in market overt."*

Any person concealing such horse, was liable to be imprisoned three months, and pay treble the value.[570]

Civil officers were authorized to seize the horses of Roman Catholics, on certain contingencies. If returned, the owners were to pay the expenses of seizing and keeping them.[571]

before such justices, mayor, &c. of the sum of *5l. 5s.* to the owner or possessor of such horse, after such payment, or tender and refusal, the property of such horse or horses, shall *be vested in the person making such discovery and tender*, as if the same had been bought and sold in market overt."[572]

* This clause had nearly proved fatal to a rascal who took advantage of it, about forty years since. He forcibly seized a horse, saddled and bridled, belonging to a Roman Catholic. But, though the law sanctioned the robbery of horses, it did not authorize that of saddles and bridles. The felon was prosecuted for the plunder of the harness, and narrowly escaped the gallows, which he so richly deserved. One other circumstance, arising from this law, may merit attention. A Catholic, who owned one of the most celebrated racers in Ireland, worth two hundred guineas, being informed that a person was about to seize him, and pay him the price fixed by law, mounted the horse, and presented him to a Protestant friend; thus defeating the miscreant of his vile purpose.

570 Robins, 451. 571 Idem, 466. 572 Idem, 450.

To increase the profligacy and turpitude of this code, a large portion of its provisions were ex post facto, and operated the work of rapine and depredation for years antecedent to their enaction. In 1710, an act was passed, annulling fines, recoveries, and settlements, made for seven years preceding.*

All collateral and other securities, by mortgages, judgments, statutes merchant, or of the staple, or otherwise howsoever, to cover, support, or make good any bargain, sale, confirmation, release, or other conveyance, were rendered null and void. And *any Protestant might sue out such mortgages, or sue for such lands, in any court of law, and obtain a verdict, and have execution to be put in possession thereof.*†

* "*All settlements, fines, common recoveries, and other conveyances had or made* since the 1st of January, 1703, of any lands, &c. by any Papist, or by any Protestant who turned Papist since the said 1st of Jan. 1703, or by any such Papist with his then Protestant wife, who hath turned Papist as aforesaid, whereby any Protestant is barred of any estate, in reversion or remainder, whereunto such Protestant was intituled at the time of levying such fine, suffering such recovery, or making such conveyance, *shall as to such Protestant be null and void.*"[573]

† "All collateral and other securities, by mortgages, judgments, statutes merchant, or of the staple or otherwise, *which have been!!! or hereafter shall be, made or entered into*, to cover, support, or secure, and make good any bargain, sale, confirmation, release, feoffment, lease, or other conveyance, contrary to 2 An. Sess. 1. c. 6. are void to the purchaser of any the said lands or tenements in trust for, or for the benefit

[573] Robins, 460.

This provision was retrospective: thus, if a Roman Catholic had lent ten thousand pounds, and, as a security for payment, taken a mortgage on real estate, any Protestant might sue out such mortgage, and rob the lender of his property! None of the legislators of Tripoli or Algiers,—none of the ferocious followers of Blackbeard, or Morgan, the pirates,—none of the banditti whose trade is rapine and plunder, ever conceived a more piratical or plundering act than this. It may be fairly said to have converted the seat of legislation into "a den of thieves."

of, any Papist, as likewise to any such Papist, his heirs and assigns, and all such lands, &c. so conveyed or leased, or to be conveyed or leased to any Papist, or to the use of, or in trust for, any Papist, contrary to the said act, and all such collateral securities as are or shall be made or entered into, to cover, support, secure or make good the same, *may be sued for by any Protestant*, by his proper action, real, personal, or mixt, founded on this act, in any of her majesty's courts of law or equity, if the nature of the case shall require it.

"Provided any Protestant may prefer one or more bill or bills in the chancery, or chancery of exchequer, against any such sale, lease, mortgage, or incumbrance, and against all persons privy to such trust for Papists; and to compel such person to discover such trusts, and answer all matters relating thereunto, as by such bill shall be required: to which bill no plea or demurrer shall be allowed: *but the defendant shall answer the same at large on oath, which answer shall be good evidence against the defendant*, in actions brought upon this act: and all issues, in any suit founded on this act, *shall be tried by none but known Protestants!!!*"[574]

[574] Robins, 464.

If any Protestant woman, possessed of real estate of any description whatever, or personal estate to the value of five hundred pounds, married, without a previous certificate that her intended husband was a Protestant, she forfeited her whole estate, which went to the next Protestant heir.*

To outrage the feelings of the wretched Helots, they were forbidden, under a penalty of ten pounds, to bury their dead in the grave-yards of

* "If any Protestant maid, or woman unmarried, being heir apparent to her ancestor, or having a sole or joint estate or interest in fee-simple or in fee-tail, or being seized in fee-simple or in coparcenary, or in common, or being seized of an estate for life or lives, by way of jointure, dower, or otherwise, or being possessed of, or entitled to any personal estate, either in money, stock, plate, jewels, or other goods and chattels, in law or equity, to the value of 500*l.* or more, shall at any time after the first of January next, [1704] marry or take to husband any person whatsoever, without having first obtained a certificate in writing, under the hand of the minister of the parish, bishop of the diocess, and some justice of the peace living near the place (or any two of them) where such person shall be resident, at the time of such marriage, that he is a known Protestant, that then, and from the time of such marriage, *such Protestant person so marrying*, *and the person she shall so marry*, *shall be for ever afterwards disabled and rendered incapable of having or enjoying all or any of the aforesaid estates or interests; and that the same shall go to*, *and be deemed to be the right and estate of the next Protestant of the kin*, to whom the same would descend by law, were such Protestant maid or woman, and all other intervening Popish heirs, executors or administrators, really dead and intestate at the time of such marriage."[575]

[575] Robins, 385.

any suppressed convent, abbey, or monastery,* where rested the remains of their ancestors!

In order to secure impartial justice, in England, foreigners, accused of petit treason, murder, or felony, are tried by a jury composed of an equal number of natives and foreigners; and juries are thus constituted in civil actions between denizens and foreigners. But, as if nothing were too sacred or holy to be trampled under foot, in Ireland, in all the cases arising under the laws "to prevent the growth of Popery," Catholics were expressly excluded from juries;† and their honour, their property, and their lives, were thus exposed to the mercy of their envenomed enemies.

If a Catholic child were sent abroad without license, it was presumed by law that he was sent

* "None shall, from the said 29th of December, bury any dead, in any suppressed monastery, abbey, or convent, that is not made use of for celebrating divine service according to the liturgy of the church of Ireland by the law established, or within the precincts thereof, *upon pain of ten pounds*."[576]

† "From the first of Michaelmas-Term, 1708, no Papist shall serve or be returned to serve on any grand jury in the Queen's Bench, or before justices of assize, oyer and terminer, or gaol delivery, or Quarter Sessions, unless it appear to the court that a sufficient number of Protestants cannot then be had for the service; and in all trials of issues, on any presentment, indictment, or information or action on any statute, for any offence committed by Papists, in breach of such laws, *the plaintiff or prosecutor may challenge any Papist returned as juror, and assign as a cause that he is a Papist, which challenge shall be allowed of!!!*"[577]

[576] Robins, 452. [577] Idem, 459.

to be educated in a foreign seminary; by which a forfeiture of his personal and of the income of his real estate was incurred. On his return, he might apply to court, and prove the cause of his absence to have been innocent: in which case, he was entitled to the future income of his real estate, but *could not be restored to the proceeds during his absence, nor to any part of his personal estate!*"*

* "If any of the king's subjects of this realm, at any time after this session of Parliament, shall pass or go, or shall convey or send, or cause to be conveyed or sent, any child or other person, into any parts beyond the seas, out of the king's obedience, to the intent to enter into, or be resident, or trained up, in any priory, abbey, nunnery, Popish university, college, or school, or house of Jesuits or priests, or in any Popish private family there; and shall be by any Popish person instructed, persuaded or strengthened in the Popish religion, in any sort to profess the same; or shall send or convey, or cause to be conveyed or sent, any money or other thing towards the maintenance of any child or other person already sent, or that shall hereafter go or be sent, to be trained up and instructed as aforesaid; or (under the name or colour of charity) towards the relief of any religious houses whatsoever; every such offender, being thereof lawfully convicted, or upon any information, presentment or indictment for any the offences aforesaid, to be found by a jury of the county, city, or town corporate, where such offender shall have any estate of inheritance at the time of the offence committed, *shall be for ever* (after such finding) *disabled to sue or prosecute any action, bill, plaint or information, in course of law*, or to sue in any court of equity, or to be guardian or executor, or administrator to any person, or capable of any legacy or deed of gift, or to bear any office within this realm, and *shall forfeit all their goods and chattels, and also all their lands, tenements and hereditaments, rents,*

Roman Catholics were prohibited from acting as guardians. An infraction of this law subjected the party to a penalty of five hundred pounds.*

*annuities, offices and estate of freehold, during their natural lives.*"[578]

"And if any person be convicted of being sent beyond the seas, contrary to this act, by the conviction of the person sending or conveying him only, such person, upon his return into this kingdom, shall, at any time within twelve months after, or within twelve months after attaining the age of twenty-one years, upon prayer, by motion to the king's bench in this kingdom, be admitted to his trial; and the judges of the said court, upon such prayer, shall cause an information to be exhibited against him, to which he shall plead; and the court shall proceed to trial thereupon, by a jury of the county where the said court shall then sit; and the defendant, at the trial, shall be obliged to prove to what intent he was sent or conveyed beyond the seas, and *unless he makes it appear that he was not sent or conveyed contrary to this act, it shall be taken for granted that he was sent to the contrary, as though the same had been fully proved.* And in case, upon trial, the party shall be acquitted, then he shall be discharged of all the disabilities, penalties and forfeitures in this act, except his goods and chattels, and the profits of his lands incurred, received before such acquittal.

"And every such person, sent or conveyed as aforesaid, that shall, within six months after his return into this kingdom, in the chancery or king's bench, in the term time, between the hours of eight and twelve in the morning, take the oaths," &c. "shall from thenceforth be discharged of all the disabilities aforesaid; and *shall from such time be restored to the receipt of the future growing rents, and profits of his said real estate only*, BUT SHALL NEVERTHELESS LOSE ALL THOSE PAST, AND ALL HIS PERSONAL ESTATE."[579]

* "No Papist shall be guardian unto, or have the tuition or custody of, any orphan or child under the age of twenty-one

[578] Robins, 185. [579] Idem, 186.

Roman Catholic house-keepers were obliged to find fit Protestant substitutes for militia duty; and, in case of neglect or refusal, to pay double the fine imposed on Protestants;* and likewise to pay, towards the support of the militia, double what the Protestants paid.†

No Catholics were allowed to purchase any part of the forfeited estates; nor to inherit, take, make title to, by descent, purchase, limitation, devise, or other conveyance, or to have, hold, or enjoy any such estates.‡ They were even prohi-

years: but the same (where the person intituled to, or having the guardianship of, such child, is or shall be a Papist) shall be disposed of by chancery to some near relation of such orphan, &c. being a Protestant, to whom the estate cannot descend.

"If any Papist shall take upon him the guardianship or tuition of any orphan or child, contrary to this act, *he shall forfeit 500l. to be recovered by action of debt.*"[580]

* "The lieutenants, &c. or the major part of them, may cause to be raised upon the Popish inhabitants, and upon every person who shall refuse to take the oath of abjuration, (which oath any justice of the peace may administer) *double the sum they should have paid by virtue of this act*, in case they had been Protestants."[581]

† "In case such Papist shall neglect or refuse to find such sufficient man, *he shall forfeit double the sum as a Protestant should forfeit*, in case such Protestant should neglect to attend the service of the militia, when thereunto required, by beat of drum or sound of trumpet, as aforesaid."[582]

‡ "Leases of the premises to be made to Protestants only, at the full improved rent, without any fine. *Leases to or in trust for Papists*, *or assigned to them*, *to be void*, and the lessor, as-

[580] Robins, 454. [581] Idem, 409. [582] Idem, 407.

bited from taking them on leases for lives or years.

Roman Catholics were prohibited, in 1702, from buying or purchasing, in their own names, or in the names of others to their use, any lands, or rents and profits out of the same, other than for a term not exceeding thirty-one years.*

No Roman Catholic could be elected mayor, bailiff, sovereign, portrieff, burgomaster, recorder, sheriff, treasurer, alderman, town-clerk, burgess, common council-man, within any city, walled town, or corporation: nor be nominated, appointed, presented, or sworn, as high constable, in any barony or half-barony; or as petty constable, in any manor, ward, parish, constablewick, or place within the kingdom: but *was to be proportionably taxed to support the same.*[583]

Some portions of this code appear so gratuitously wicked and profligate, that it is difficult even to conjecture what could have been the object of the miscreants by whom they were en-

signor, and lessee or assignee, accepting or occupying such lands, *to forfeit treble the yearly value*."[584]

* "Every Papist, after the time aforesaid, shall be disabled to purchase, either in his own name or in the name of any other, to his use or in trust for him, any manors, lands, hereditaments, or any rents or profits out of the same, or any leases or terms thereof, other than for a term of years not exceeding thirty-one years, whereon a rent, *not less than two-thirds of the improved yearly value* at the time of making such lease, shall be reserved and made payable during such term."[585]

[583] 2 Geo. I. xii. [584] Robins, 26. [585] Idem, 454.

acted. So late as the year 1745, it was provided, that all marriages celebrated by a Roman Catholic clergyman, between two Protestants, or between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic, should be *null and void, to all intents and purposes, without any process, judgment, or sentence of the law whatsoever.** To what a hideous flood of licentiousness; what overwhelming immorality; what bastardizing of children; what uncertainty of inheritance, must this vile law have given rise!

Justices of peace might summon any person, suspected of having been married by a Roman Catholic priest, or been present at such marriage; and if such person refused to attend, or to be examined, or to enter into recognizance to prosecute, *he was liable to three years imprisonment.*[586]

Dreading lest the piratical and sanguinary system they were establishing should lead to insurrection, in which they might meet the fate their tyranny deserved, the "ascendency" early determined to secure themselves from that consequence, by robbing and plundering the Catholics

* "After the first of May, 1746, every marriage celebrated by a Popish priest, between a Papist and any person who hath been, or hath professed himself or herself to be a Protestant, at any time within twelve months of such celebration of marriage, or between two Protestants, *shall be null and void, to all intents and purposes, without any process, judgment, or sentence of the law whatsoever.*"[587]

586 Robins, 389.

587 2 Geo. II. xiii. 19.

of their arms;* thus in a manner tying them neck and heels, and laying them prostrate at their mercy.

The laws on this point, which was regarded as vital to the security of the tyrants, were of the most extraordinary rigour. Two justices of the peace might summon before them any Catholics, from the peer or peeress to the lowest peasant, and examine them, on oath, not merely on the subject of arms in their own possession, but oblige them to turn informers against their parents, children, friends, and neighbours; and if they refused to appear, or, on appearing, refused to give evidence, or turn informers, peers and peeresses were subject to a penalty of three hundred pounds, for the first offence; and for the second, to *imprisonment for life, and forfeiture of all their goods!!*†

* "All Papists within this kingdom of Ireland, before the 1st of March next, shall discover and deliver up to some justice of the peace, *all their arms*, *armour*, *and ammunition*, *of what kind soever*, *in their possession;* and after that time, any two or more justices of the peace, within their respective limits, and all mayors, sheriffs and chief officers of cities, &c. in their liberties, by themselves or their warrants, under their hands and seals, may search for, seize, or cause to be searched for and seized, and take into their custody, all such arms, &c. as shall be concealed in any house, lodging or other places where they suspect any such to be."[588]

† "Two justices of peace, or the magistrate of any corporation, are empowered to summon before them any persons whatsoever, to tender them an oath, by which they oblige

[588] Robins, 448.

By this law, the best man in the land might be summoned by two justices of the peace, at the instance of the lowest scoundrel, and an oath tendered to him to inform against his nearest or dearest friend. The same oath might be tendered to him a second time, within an hour; and if he refused both times, he was, ipso facto, liable to be robbed of his goods, and subject to imprisonment for life!!

Lest there should be any scruples of conscience among the justices, which might prevent their activity in the enforcement of such a system of rapine, any magistrate who should neglect or refuse to perform the duties it imposed on him, was subject to fifty pounds penalty.*

All wise legislators justly hold, that one of their most important duties is to provide for the instruction and illumination of the people, under a

them to discover all persons who have any arms concealed, contrary to law. Their refusal or declining to appear, or, on appearing, their refusal to inform, subjects them to the severest penalties. *If peers or peeresses are summoned*, (for they may be summoned by the bailiff of a corporation of six cottages) *to perform this honourable service, and they refuse to inform, the first offence is 300l. penalty; the second is premunire, that is to say, imprisonment for life, and forfeiture of all their goods.* Persons of an inferior order are for the first offence fined 30*l.* for the second, they too are subjected to premunire."[589]

* "If any justice or justices of peace, mayor, &c. neglect or refuse to execute any the powers which they are required by this act to put in execution, *every such justice shall forfeit, for every such offence, the sum of* 50*l.*"[590]

[589] Burke, V. 195. [590] Robins, 459.

conviction that public instruction and virtue, ignorance and vice, grow to maturity together. But the Irish Parliament doomed five-sixths of the nation, to which it was given as a curse, to perpetual and invincible ignorance! To brutalize and barbarize those Helots, to plunge them into the abysses of Cimmerian darkness, they were, at one stroke, cut off from education. The law punished the man who

"Taught the young idea how to shoot,"

who assisted to remove that brutal ignorance which prepares the mind for every species of vice and crime, as severely as the man who robbed altars, burned houses, or murdered his father or mother!

This never-enough-to-be-execrated code was far worse than Draco's, which is

"Damn'd to everlasting fame."

Draco, barbarous and cruel as he was, in his sanguinary code, which punished all crimes with death, has never been accused of punishing any thing but crimes. But the worse than Draconian Irish legislature denounced banishment, and, in case of return, death, against any Catholic guilty of the offence of teaching school; instructing children in learning, in a private house; or officiating as usher to a Protestant school-master!*

* "*If any Papist shall publicly teach school, or instruct youth in learning in any private house, or shall be entertained to instruct youth, as usher or assistant to any Protestant school-master, he shall be esteemed a Popish regular clergyman, and*

The eternal laws of humanity, imprinted on our hearts by our great Creator, command sympathy for our suffering fellow creatures, and, when in our power, the extension of relief to their miseries. The rudest savages are not insensible to the sway of this universal and sovereign law. They share their slender pittance with the distressed and suffering stranger. Christ Jesus himself, in the most emphatical language he ever used, in "words that burn," denounces "everlasting fire" against those who refuse obedience to this law:

"Depart from me, ye cursed! into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels! for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not."

This divine lesson the impious and barbarous Irish legislature, with a wicked hypocrisy, which enhanced the atrocity of the deed, trampled under foot, under pretence of propagating, in its utmost purity, the religion of that Jesus Christ, of whose precepts and maxims their laws were an undeviating violation. By those laws, if Francis Xavier, Fleury, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Massillon, cardinal Pole, archbishop Carroll, bishop Cheve-reux, Mr. Matignon, Mr. Harding, Mr. Fleming, or Mr. Græssel, were in Ireland, and "hungry, and

*prosecuted as such, and shall incur such penalties and forfeitures as any Popish regular convict is liable unto.*"[591]

[591] Robins, 612.

thirsty, and naked, and sick, and in prison," at the last gasp of existence, for want of the common necessaries of life, the man who *three times* administered relief, would be robbed of his entire estate, real and personal, as a reward for his charity!* Can the vocabulary of execration afford terms of reproach adequate to brand the turpitude of such a system, and of its vile authors?

Throughout the whole habitable globe, even among the most barbarous of the human race, respect and reverence for parents have been universally inculcated, except in devoted Ireland. The fifth command of the decalogue explicitly orders,

"Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

This is "the first command with a promise of reward" for its observance; but no punishment is annexed to the violation. Deuteronomy, however, goes further, and pronounces a curse on those who even slight their parents:

"Cursed be he that setteth light by his father or mother."

And Jesus Christ, the light of whose Gospel the

* "Any person that shall, from the first of May, knowingly conceal or entertain any such archbishop, bishops, &c. hereby required to depart out of this kingdom, or that after the said day shall come into this kingdom, shall, for the first offence, *forfeit twenty pounds;* for the second, *double that sum;* and if he offend the third time, *shall forfeit all his lands and tenements of freehold or inheritance during his life; and also all his goods and chattels!!!*"[592]

[592] Robins, 452.

Irish legislators pretended to spread, renewed and enforced the command,

"Honour thy father and thy mother."[593]

But what was the dictate of the hideous code "to prevent the growth of Popery?" Did it support or countenance the observance of this holy law of Moses and of Jesus Christ? No: it said, in language fit for pirates and robbers, Forswear your religion, and then you have legal sanction to plunder your father and mother, and bring their gray hairs with sorrow to the grave.* In return for all their cares, their solicitudes, their pains, their affection, strip them of that property which ought to support your brothers and sisters. This was the unequivocal spirit of Irish legislation, on the subject of filial duty.

When any child or children of any Roman Catholic, other than the eldest son, whose case was provided for before, conformed to the Protestant religion, the father was obliged to give in, upon oath, to the court of chancery, a statement of the real and bona fide value of all his estate, real and personal; and make such provision for the pre-

* "The eldest son, so conforming, immediately acquires, and *in the life time of his father*, the permanent part, what our law calls *the reversion and inheritance of the estate*, and he discharges it by retrospect; and annuls every sort of voluntary settlement made by the father ever so long before his conversion. This he may sell or dispose of immediately, and alienate it from the family for ever."[594]

[593] Matth. xix. 19. [594] Burke, V. 187.

sent and future maintenance of the conforming child or children, as the court might order.[595]

---

Of this code of laws, it may be fairly averred, that, had all the penitentiaries in Europe been ransacked, to form a legislature for Ireland,—had Cartouche and his gang taken possession of the Parliament-house, they could not have devised a more rapacious or cruel system.

There is hardly a code in the world, that does not afford some instances of unjust and immoral laws, enacted in moments of delusion or faction. But this is the only one universally and undeviatingly profligate and depraved,—of which every provision and paragraph violated some law of God or man, and the plainest dictates of eternal justice,—and which legalized robbery, and punished with death acts of humanity, teaching schools, the celebration of marriage, &c. &c.

The professed object of the hypocritical tyrants who framed this "ferocious system," as Burke appropriately styles it, was to rescue the objects of its rapacity from the darkness of Popish idolatry. But they might worship Jupiter Ammon, Juno, Venus, Mars, Bacchus, and Apollo, with the Romans; the sun, with the Guebres; or Apis, with the Egyptians; they might even disbelieve in God altogether.* Provided they forswore transubstantiation and the Pope's authority, they became pure and immaculate; their property and persons

* See Burke's view of the subject, supra, vii. [595] Robins, 459.

were secure; and, under the forms and ceremonies of the law of the land, they then acquired a right to rob and plunder the blind idolatrous Papists whom they had abandoned.

Whoever has travelled through these pages, and duly considered the villany of those statutes, and of the legislators by whom they were enacted; the horrible scenes of oppression, fraud, and murder, which they could not fail to produce; the universal demoralization that must have followed their operation,—cannot fail to agree with Tillotson, that, so far as respected the devoted island whose fate we deplore, it were

"Better there were no revealed religion, and that human nature were left to the conduct of its own principles and inclinations, which are much more mild and merciful, much more for the peace and happiness of human society, than *to be actuated by a religion that inspires men with so vile a fury, and prompts them to commit such outrages*."[596]

Tillotson applied this strong position to other parts of Christendom; but shut his eyes to the wickedness, the profligacy, and the immorality of the code in force in his native country;*—so much easier is it to take the mote out of our neighbour's eye, than the beam out of our own.

We have now, however, in this enlightened country, bigoted clergymen, who cant, and whine, and turn up the whites of their eyes, deploring

* The English laws on this subject were as wicked and cruel as the Irish.

[596] Tillotson, III. 19.

and reviling the persecuting spirit of Madrid, and Lisbon, and Paris, and Rome, and Goa; but, like Tillotson, deaf, and blind, and dumb, to the atrocious system of persecution for ages in operation in England and Ireland. If they attend to the maxim of Jesus Christ, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone," they will lay an eternal embargo on their tongues, upon this odious, this detestable subject. Sat verbum.

Here we close:—and ask the reader, to whatever nation, religion, party, or faction, he may belong, whether there ever existed a more horrible system of tyranny? And whether resistance to it, in any of its stages, whatever might have been the result, would not have deserved a nobler name than the odious one of *Rebellion?*

"Rebellion! foul, dishonouring word,
  Whose wrongful blight so oft has stain'd
The holiest cause that tongue or sword
  Of mortal ever lost or gain'd.
How many a spirit, born to bless,
  Has sunk beneath that withering name,
Whom but a day's, an hour's success
  Had wafted to eternal fame!
As exhalations, when they burst
From the warm earth, if chill'd at first,
If check'd in soaring from the plain,
Darken to fogs and sink again;
But, if they once triumphant spread
Their wings above the mountain-head,
Become enthron'd in upper air,
And turn to sun-bright glories there!"—*Lalla Rookh.*

THE END.

# INDEX.

## ERRATA.

Page 71, line 15, for *destroys*, read *invalidates.*
" 77, " 10, for *annexed*, read *prefixed.*
" 98, " 24, for *opinions*, read *prejudices.*
" 100, " 16, for *the whole*, read *six counties of the.*
" 110, " 7, for *deserved*, read *they might perhaps have deserved.*
" 235, " 10, for *wonted*, read *utmost.*

Sundry other errors may probably be found in the work; to which the reader, it is hoped, will extend indulgence.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

DA 940 C32 Carey, Mathew
Vindiciae